RELIGION *on* The Campus

Class 243.2 Book N213
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

Purchased from the fund bequeathed to the Seminary by
EUGENE AUGUSTUS HOFFMAN, D. D.
DEAN 1879-1902

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/religiononcampus0000fran_g9b4

RELIGION ON THE CAMPUS

The Report of the National Student Conference, Milwaukee, Dec. 28, 1926 to Jan. 1, 1927

Edited by

FRANCIS P. MILLER

COUNCIL OF CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS
Student Council, Y. W. C. A., 600 Lexington Avenue
Student Department, Y.M.C.A., 347 Madison Avenue
New York City

Published by

ASSOCIATION PRESS

NEW YORK: 347 MADISON AVENUE

1927

243.2
N213
82810

COPYRIGHT, 1927
THE GENERAL BOARD OF
THE YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

PAGE

OPENING PRAYER v

INTRODUCTION vii

I. THE PURPOSE AND HOPE OF THIS CONFERENCE
BRUCE CURRY 1

CAN GOD BE ACCESSIBLE TO US AND HOW?

II. THE PRACTICAL UNBELIEF OF MODERN CIVILIZATION ..... REINHOLD NIEBUHR 11

III. HOW JESUS FOUND FELLOWSHIP WITH GOD
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN 22

IV. MODERN SCIENCE AND THE ACCESSIBILITY OF GOD ..... G. A. STUDDERT KENNEDY 32

V. FINDING GOD ..... HOWARD C. THURMAN 48

A GOD WHO IS THE FATHER OF ALL MANKIND

VI. JESUS' CONCEPTION OF GOD AS THE FATHER OF ALL ..... CHARLES W. GILKEY 55

VII. HOW CHRISTIANS MAKE IT DIFFICULT FOR THE WORLD TO BELIEVE IN CHRIST
TIMOTHY T. LEW 62

VIII. THE MEANING OF GOD'S UNIVERSAL FATHERHOOD IN THE RELATIONS OF THE RACES
MORDECAI JOHNSON 80

IX. INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND THE RELIGION OF JESUS ..... KIRBY PAGE 95

THE DIVINE POSSIBILITIES OF HUMAN LIFE

X. JESUS' VIEW OF THE DIVINE POSSIBILITIES OF HUMAN LIFE ..... HAROLD C. PHILLIPS 117

XI. THE CHANGING CONCEPTION OF GOD AND OF DUTY ..... ROBERT A. MILLIKAN 129

XII. THE FINDINGS OF MODERN PSYCHOLOGY AND THE POTENTIALITIES OF HUMAN LIFE
HARRISON S. ELLIOTT 143

XIII. THE CROSS ..... G. A. STUDDERT KENNEDY 161

PAGE

APPENDICES

A. THE SPEAKERS WHO DELIVERED THE ADDRESSES 185
B. MORNING DISCUSSION GROUPS 186
C. INFORMAL DISCUSSION GROUPS 188
D. FINDINGS 194
E. CONFERENCE STATISTICS 196
F. ORGANIZATIONS AND COMMITTEES REPRESENTED IN THE EXHIBIT 196
G. THE OFFICERS OF THE CONFERENCE AND THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE 196

OPENING PRAYER

This prayer was used during a period of worship conducted by David R. Porter at the opening of the Conference.

O God, Spirit of Life and Truth and Love, Who dost ever reveal Thyself to those who have eyes to see and who seek Thee with all their hearts; grant us Thy presence and aid as we are met together in this Conference. Thou seest our lives set in the midst of vast areas of confusion and human need; and yet we dare to thank Thee for the vision Thou hast given us of a whole world becoming obedient to the will of Christ. Thou hast called us to a ministry of reconciliation; help us first to be reconciled to Thee.

Grant us Thy forgiveness, for our eyes are yet heavy with sleep, that we do not realize either Thy call to us or Thy mighty resources around us; we are very sorry for the preoccupation and the subterfuge that make us satisfied with impoverished lives and meager achievement. Reveal unto us what Thou seest which has made our witness and ministry so ineffective.

As we enter into our fellowship here, give unto us, we beseech Thee, a readiness to share both in speaking and in listening; save us from barren curiosity and all false pride of personal opinion; may our conference together be creative and kindling. Save us from slothfulness of intellect and from all failure in self-discipline for the sake of our common good.

Even while we pray to Thee for ourselves we cannot forget those loved ones afar whom we love dearer than life itself, and Thy needy children everywhere; we would put at Thy disposal whatever we have of spiritual power as we remember those whose hopes have been crushed; those who suffer from needless poverty or preventable dis-

ease; those oppressed by our race prejudice and lack of love. Help us to maintain and strengthen all that is good in our heritage in the Church and in the Student Association Movement.

Make us worthy to follow in the train of those former members of our Movement who in all vocations have gladly given their whole lives for the world-wide Kingdom of Jesus Christ, our Lord. In His name we pray.

INTRODUCTION

The Milwaukee National Student Conference was a phenomenon of more than ordinary significance in its potential influence upon American life and particularly upon the future of the Church of Christ in this country.

It was significant because:

1. It dramatized the participation of Christ's men around the world in one supernational community.

2. It achieved an essentially catholic outlook through the inclusiveness of its program and through its success in weaving into one creative pattern a wide variety of experiences and points of view.

3. It demonstrated the spiritual vitality and moral effectiveness of a self-directed student movement.

Perhaps this last achievement is the greatest of all. In a day when the democratic ideal is becoming progressively inoperative as a refining and civilizing influence in American life because of its perversion in political and industrial relations, there is something very impressive about a student movement bent upon discovering a system of organized corporate relationships which is intended to facilitate rather than retard the expression of a purer form of the democratic spirit. In many American institutions (both governmental and religious) democracy has become an organizational device providing the people with a false sense of participation in creative action in order that a paternalistic bureaucracy may be left undisturbed to carry out its own policy. At Milwaukee one was conscious of an entirely different relationship between "the citizens" and their "executives." It is probably the first great national conference where there was little or no sense of conflict between "managers" and

"delegates." The conference was the creation of the movement to which the delegates belonged. For months the Conference Committee had been serving as a correlator and integrator for the desires of the movement as expressed through its councils and regional conferences. Further, the Business Committee of the conference itself seemed extraordinarily sensitive to the movements of thought and currents of interest among the delegates. Day by day the mind of the conference registered with the Business Committee and was translated by it into action. The result was the prevalence of a spirit of mutual confidence and trust which vastly increased the creative possibilities of the conference.

The success of the conference in achieving what I have referred to as an essentially catholic outlook is of no less significance for the future of religion in America. The single-track mind has been the peculiar curse of the Church in this country. And there were some at Milwaukee who deplored the fact that their own particular brand of religion was not having entire right of way. It is to the eternal credit of the Student Association Movement that it refused to be captured by any one of the "schools" but insisted upon a program which presented various kinds of religion in order that the delegates might learn to welcome truths and reject untruths from whatever source they come. It must have been for many an amazingly fresh and novel experience to have been exposed during the course of one day to such different points of view as those represented by Dr. Millikan, Professor Elliott, and Mr. Studdert Kennedy.

One was tremendously impressed by the number of people who really seemed to care about making the conference the very best conference possible. There were scores of people with important responsibilities, sometimes not very well coordinated, and yet many visitors remarked upon the apparent smoothness with which the conference moved forward. That is a tribute both to the executive officers of the conference

and to the determination of the local associations to build up an intercollegiate movement which is a genuine expression of their own lives.

It was also tremendously encouraging to observe the amount of self-control that the democratic movement among students has acquired during the past few years. The twenty-five hundred delegates who sat through several sessions when the floor was open for general debate seemed to have a sense of the dignity of their corporate life unusual in such large gatherings. There were a few embryonic demagogues, but these found the "herd" much steadier than it usually is and much more skeptical of the devices of the demagogue.

Perhaps in no former conference of this kind have there been so few platform addresses in proportion to the total program or so many other means through which the delegates could share in different ways in the life of the conference. The morning discussion groups do not seem to have played the large part in stimulating creative thinking that many had hoped. However, that disappointment was more than compensated for by the vitality of the spontaneous and impromptu events for which time had been allowed in the afternoon. Among the contributions which Milwaukee will make to the technique of future conferences one of the most important will be this very wise provision for a free time each day during which delegates were encouraged to make their own choices as to what they would do. The stereopticon slides shown before each evening session and the pageant deserve special mention as having made unique contributions to the life and thought of the delegates. The Exhibit Room was in some ways the symbol of the spirit of unity which pervaded the conference. There were booths representing all the more important movements working in the student field. We saw ourselves in perspective and in relation to one common task.

No comments are needed upon the addresses which form

the major part of this report. They provided the principal ideas around which discussion centered and stand upon their own merit. It was the decision of the Conference Committee that the published report should be limited in size in order that it might appear more readable and also be less expensive. This has made it impossible to include all of the platform addresses and other proceedings.

There is surely ground for tremendous encouragement in the fact that in a day when America is becoming the most powerful capitalistic unit among the nations, there should be among the American colleges a movement seeking to discover and utilize the resources of Jesus Christ for American society, and that at a time when the tone of our Thanksgiving Day Proclamations and political speeches gives us away as the most complacently self-righteous people on earth, this student movement should have some sense of sin in behalf of the United States and should be reaching out toward Christian student groups in other lands to express its sense of Christendom—its sense of a loyalty to Christ's men around the world, a loyalty which transcends all national and racial limitations.

"By faith Abraham went out—not knowing whither he went—for he looked for a city which hath foundation whose builder and maker is God."

I am a wanderer.
I remember well one journey,
How I feared the way was missed.
So long the city I desired to see lay hid.
When suddenly its spires afar
Gleamed through the circling clouds.
You can conceive my transport.
Soon the vapors closed again,
But I had seen the city,
And one such glimpse no darkness can obscure.
And may God deny you peace and give you glory.

FRANCIS P. MILLER.

RELIGION ON THE CAMPUS

I

THE PURPOSE AND HOPE OF THIS CONFERENCE

BRUCE CURRY

When we state the theme of this conference, "What Resources Has Jesus for Life in Our World?" it reflects the fact that the central interest of this student gathering is in *Life* as we are trying to live it in a world such as ours. We are concerned with the resources of Jesus because they seem to promise vital help on our task of living. It is also implied that students are not satisfied with the way life is going, in their personal experience and in that of humanity. That such a conference as this should be held at all speaks for an underlying restlessness, a real discontent with things as they are.

Youth especially is haunted by the dream of richness, beauty, and strength which life should afford in contrast with the muddled, thwarted existence which seems to be about all that most people can manage. Students want to live "bravely, colorfully, and freely," but find life about them poured in molds which somehow defeat this aim—molds of institution, custom, and attitude. As one of your number has put it: "We have been born into a world which is weary, browbeaten, tragically bitter, yet with a determination not to be changed." Youth is therefore in a mood to question and to doubt all such attitudes, customs, and institutions on which society has banked—the home, the school, the church, the state, the economic order, with all their rules, regulations, and assumptions. And surely youth

has the right to question them. As Dorsey says, "the least we can do is to keep our hands off the courage of youth."

Yet when students themselves are asked for constructive suggestions, when they are given a chance to experiment as they like, the results are largely disheartening, even to themselves. They thresh about courageously in thought and even in action but come back confessing that they get almost nowhere. Some have smashed the social conventions only to come to with headache, disillusionment, boredom. Little groups have protested and crusaded in the interest of brave causes such as brotherhood, justice, and fair play, yet feel that they made but little dent upon the situation. It was easy to say what was wrong with the old, much harder to build the new. Let us say "Bravo for those who have tried anything seriously!" There is more hope in them than in those complacent majorities on our campuses who seem blissfully unconscious that a new hour is here. It is for those who have struck their tents and are on the move that I speak when I say that in their truest moments they are more than a little puzzled, unhappy, distrustful of themselves, wistful. A recent article in the *Atlantic* quotes one of the younger generation as saying: "I'm getting to the end of the things I want to do. I've done all the things I've been told not to—and they aren't so amusing as they looked. There's a screw loose somewhere. . . . Suppose we were to pick out somebody who is decent and find out what it is about him."

That last suggestion, that we pick out someone who is decent and find out what it is about him, is exactly the proposal of this Conference. And we take as that someone Jesus, because we find no one else to whom we can go with such great hope and expectation. Just beyond the circle of our confused striving he stands with his claim to have the way of life, to be the way of life. A young man he was who faced a world not so different from our own in its denial of the good life. By common consent he is

acknowledged to have lived bravely, colorfully, freely, significantly, and effectively, above all the sons of men. Because he challenged the old order of his day they put him to death as a dangerous radical. Yet "nineteen wide centuries have come and gone and today he is the centerpiece of the human race and the leader of the column of progress."

But how was he able to do it? What had he that we of today lack? What was it about him that gave him the secret of life? What did he know and experience that might show us the way out? And are his resources available and usable and effective in such an age as ours? These are the questions about which this Conference centers.

If we turn to Jesus for his own explanation, we find him referring his unique experience to a vital fellowship with God, whom he called Father—a fellowship which he said we all might have, a fellowship to which he could introduce us. But at this point I seem to feel some students shy off, as if to say, "Oh, now you're talking religion." Suppose we are, is one to be afraid of the word? If we really want life in our world to be its fullest and best, if we desire a share in the remaking of that life, it becomes both unscientific and insincere not to follow and test to the full the proposal of Jesus.

Of course one can readily understand why the average student is suspicious of the thing he thinks of as "religion." It seems to him to have broken down in our modern world. To one it seems uncoupled from life, from his dream of freedom and beauty and love. To another many of the tenets of religion seem intellectually dishonest and impossible in the light of modern scientific knowledge. Another feels that religion is morally ineffective, weak, sold out to the existing order, a rather sorry stage play. And yet the question persists: Is it *religion* that is open to these criticisms, or is it rather the shell of religion, which may be all that we have seen? Is there below the outer layers a kernel of reality to which we might break through? Did the reli-

gion of Jesus contain a wine of life which our Christianity has lost? Is it something we can rediscover? Would it work for people like us and under the conditions of our day? Could it transform life in line with our truest ideals? These, again, are the very questions to which this Conference must seek an answer.

For four days we shall give ourselves with all that we have to this inquiry. You have learned that for definiteness of handling we shall take up each day, beginning tonight, one of the great assumptions of Jesus which seem to express what his resources were, and shall ask what that means for us. For example, he achieved his marvelous life on the basis that at the heart of the universe there is a God whom we may call Father, with whom therefore we share life, with whom one may commune in prayer and have fellowship in work. Can we believe or experience all that in the light of modern science? The words are still used in religious circles, the experience itself is all too rare. Doubtless there are students here to whom such ideas mean just nothing. Yet what a sheen could be recaptured for life if all that is true and available for men!

Again, Jesus' resources included his belief that this Father God is impartial in his love, with its corollary that we who share his life must be impartial in our love of one another—that is, must practice universal brotherhood—that the strong must bear the burdens of the weak, that those who have must share without limit with those who need. The living out of this faith glorified his life and opened the way for understanding and good will among men. But can we adopt that and really take it seriously in a world like ours, barricaded with racial discriminations, social and class distinctions, national and creedal intolerances? We shall have a day to think this out.

Another open doorway into life for Jesus was his conviction that, God being a universal Father, men are his children and share in his nature. That is, he believed in human nature

and had confidence that its destiny was to express the divine. He set no limits to what anyone is potentially, and, therefore, may become. He believed human nature could be changed, that men could be born again or from above. To him no one was hopeless. But can we accept and practice that in a world whose maxims are that you can't change human nature, that whole classes or races are hopeless, that determinism rules the fate of us all? We shall need another day to face this question frankly.

Then Jesus drew on sources of greatest dynamic in his thought that this Father God is engaged in a great moral struggle in which men must share; that God cares until it hurts, and that only such love, sparing not itself, has the power to win out; that this is the true meaning of self-realization; that the way of the Cross is the way of ultimate joy, the way to find oneself, the way to life resplendent. We may admit all this for Jesus, but can we today try to live by it when our atmosphere is surcharged with a philosophy of "get yours while the getting is good," "every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost"? This crucial question will occupy us on our final day.

Of course none of us are interested to discuss in a vacuum these questions about Jesus and his resources. They must gear into our life situations and difficulties at every point if they are to help us. This means that there is no question, individual or social, which cannot freely be brought out in the formal or informal discussions of this Conference to test and be tested by the contribution of Jesus. Each one of us here must start from just where he is, from that which he feels is blocking him and his world from the unity and wholeness of life which he seeks.

Just where are we, then, we of many types who make up this great assemblage? For this Conference assumes from the outset that we have not all reached the same stage in our spiritual pilgrimage, and that these very differences may

make for enrichment, as we seek to be ourselves rather than that which we might feel someone expects us to be.

First, there must be students here whose friends would be surprised or amused to find them even attending a Christian conference. Perhaps they think of themselves as only mildly interested in what we are doing here, as playing around the fringes of the Conference with little danger of being drawn into its depths. Robert Louis Stevenson said of Robert Burns that he was not so much interested in religion as haunted by it, and this may well express the situation for some who are here. Some may be just a bit afraid of what this Conference might do to them.

Second, there must be some here who in desperation have grasped at this Conference as a drowning man might clutch at a straw, who may be saying to themselves, "If I cannot find reality and help here, I'm through." Their difficulties may range from intellectual turmoil to a sense of personal moral failure and disintegration. It may be hard for them to talk about it, yet they may fail themselves and the rest of us if they remain silent.

Third, it would be strange if we have not here many who might be called radicals on social issues, who are eager to do something about what is wrong with the campus or the world but who really do not see where God comes in, or prayer, or sacramental worship. They have the bit in their teeth and are ready to go. They may even wonder whether this Conference is wasting time talking about resources when to their ears the bugles on a dozen fronts are blowing "Charge!"

Fourth, we doubtless have among us a number of mystics, in spirit if not in name. They may look on these days as an opportunity for the quiet search after God. Some of them may be very practical mystics; some of them may desire and make an opportunity for extra times of retreat and meditation.

Fifth, there may be a large number here who are just

conventionally religious, who for years have been going through the motions of religious activities but would have to confess that their religion means very little. Their interests, attitudes and enthusiasms are perhaps about the same as those of their friends who make no religious profession. They are like one whom Dr. Johnston Ross described in these words: "The pallors of his life are Christian, its rubicund joys are pagan." Some of these may be unawake to the meaninglessness of their experience. Others of them may have come with eager restlessness hoping to discover reality.

Sixth, perhaps the majority here, attracted by the content of the program, belong to the class who have had some vital Christian experience, enough to make them suspect that there is more in it than they have discovered, and they are here on that quest. Having made themselves the foes of all that hurts and bruises human life, and having already broken a lance in the good fight, they yet find themselves inadequate to carry on with the success which they desire, with the drive to which they feel Jesus held the secret. Some of them are as eager for change as any of the radicals but they feel that the only hope of constructive radicalism lies in possessing itself of more understanding and more spiritual dynamic. Hence, for them, this Conference.

There may be students present who feel that they do not come under any of the heads of this classification, or that they combine different factors which I have mentioned. The chief thing to be desired is that each one of us seek to find where we are and where we really want to be, and be true to ourselves and to one another.

The Conference does not assume that the Christian Student Movement of this country is composed only of undergraduates, but rather that its ongoing life includes graduate students, faculty, alumni and alumnæ, and those friends of students who give themselves professionally or unprofessionally to the enrichment of students' thinking and

experiments. To all of these this Conference looks for help. Many undergraduates have discovered that the thirst for the purple wine of heaven is not limited to persons under twenty-two years of age, that there are older groups just as restless and open-minded and courageous as themselves, and that there is something to learn from the rather broader experience of these older campaigners. Thus unitedly we set ourselves to the wholesome give and take of these days of conference.

What have we all, then, a right to ask of this Conference? Let us say: just what it has a right to ask of us—intellectual honesty and moral robustness.

This intellectual honesty demands of us all that we deal with facts and handle them fairly; that we keep our thinking as free as possible from prejudice and other emotional agitation. There are no short cuts to the reality which we seek here. We cannot take at second-hand another's understanding or experience. We can try to avoid the blinking of facts and the fogging of our thinking.

This moral robustness demands that all of us be unafraid to face ourselves and our world, both at our worst and at our potential best. It will be tragedy to deny either our soul sickness on the one hand or our chance of being cured on the other. It means also that we must have the moral courage to see that this Conference gets behind the smoke screens by which we tend to evade anything which might penetrate to our pitiable pride and woeful weakness. This moral robustness also involves us in being unafraid to commit ourselves to the new life as fast as it opens its doors to us. Not to do so will be a proof of insincerity.

If we really want adventure, here it is on its highest plane. How much chance are we willing to take? How much excess baggage will we throw away? Who will tear up his "safety-first" mottoes and actually venture to try this new way of Jesus?

CAN GOD BE ACCESSIBLE TO US AND HOW?

II

THE PRACTICAL UNBELIEF OF MODERN CIVILIZATION

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

It has been the fashion of some college students in every generation to doff their coonskin coats and adjust their diamond stickpins and meditate solemnly upon their intellectual right to believe in God. I do not want to be contemptuous of these intellectual problems. I do not say that there are not intellectual difficulties in holding to the sublime affirmation that at the heart of this universe there is personal goodness, a soul that loves.

It is not easy to believe in a loving God in a universe so full let us say of lies and lions, so full of evil. It is not easy to believe in a moral God in a universe that seems to be ordered by such inexorable laws. It never has been easy; it is a little more difficult now that science has revealed cause and effect so intimately connected that we wonder where the place is for the intervention of a free intelligence. It isn't easy, but it isn't impossible, and as philosophy begins to gather up the fragments of science, it proves to us that the determinism, under the shadow of which most of us are living, is to a certain extent only the way that outraged truth has of avenging itself, and that it is not now impossible and never will be impossible to believe that at the heart of the universe there is freedom and therefore goodness and therefore love and therefore personality.

But the real enemy of religion never has been skepticism; the real enemy of religion is cynicism. Our real difficulties are not intellectual difficulties but moral difficulties.

The question is not whether God is intellectually worthy of us, but whether we are morally worthy of God. The question is not whether we can harmonize the concept of a loving God with a ruthless nature, but whether we can harmonize the concept of a loving God with a sort of ruthless civilization which we have built. For it is not possible to believe that personality is at the heart of things if we do not believe in personality. It is not possible to believe that goodness is at the heart of things if we do not strive after goodness, if we believe that the ethical life is both impossible and unnecessary.

The unbelief of our day is not the unbelief of skepticism, but of cynicism, and comes on the whole out of a civilization which outrages personality by its machinery and which has in general given up any faith in an ethical life.

I suppose that no civilization has ever been altogether ethical. Some civilizations, I think, have aspired more diligently than ours to the ethical ideal. No civilization has ever been altogether ethical, but never has there been a civilization in which the unethical nature of society has been revealed so obviously as in ours. So we find that our faith in goodness and in personality is again and again dissipated by the facts of the world in which we live, which we make, and of which we are a part. While it may be true that no civilization has ever been ethical and that we are only more conscious of the unethical nature of our civilization, it is also true that in some respects this is the most unethical civilization that the world has known. Civilization itself is unethical, partly because our very religion rediscovered the individual soul which had been lost by an institutional religion, and so became obsessed by the drama of the inner life and developed a religious quietism, of undoubted charm, but morally too impotent to reach the periphery of society itself.

Our civilization is unethical partly because it is puritan. Puritanism developed a frantic type of morality in the simple

relationships of life only to let life in its complex relationships go to hell.

Our civilization is unethical partly because it is complex, as Mr. Tawney has well observed. It was too complex for the old ethical concepts, and man in the period of transition did not have the intellectual energy to build new ethical restraints; so civilization just took its own unguided course and we developed the nice theory in the nineteenth century that an ethical life or society was not only impossible, but unnecessary; that if you could balance the selfishness of one man against that of another, the selfishness of one nation against the selfishness of another, you would come out all right in the end.

The saints of the day when civilization was becoming complex met, as Mr. Tawney says, each new complexity with a righteous fury and an insistence that this was a new stratagem of mammon, but they were rendered incapable, by their very fury, to think sanely and coolly upon the ethical problems of life and so they failed in those tasks which require a sane ethical intelligence as much as religious enthusiasm.

Our civilization is unethical partly because it is a product of sentimentality, of romanticism, which effaced ethical distinctions and launched mankind upon a sea of sentimentality. It is an interesting fact that this romantic period which ushered in our modern civilization, more specifically modern, began with a sentimental aspiration for liberty, equality, and fraternity, and ended with the imperialism of Napoleon; and Napoleon is still to this day to a certain extent the symbol and the patron saint of Western civilization.

Whatever the reasons may be (and these may not be all the reasons) we are living in an essentially unethical society, a society that does not believe that finally men can be ethical in their dominant attitudes, which has no greater hope than that they may develop private and petty decencies which may be a thin façade behind which they can hide the brutali-

ties of life. Now we are just wise enough to destroy the façade again and again and to see the brute facts of life behind it, and that is why our faith is periodically dissipated.

One might say that modern religion, that any kind of decent aspiration for fellowship with God, has four enemies: First, the cynicism of the strong man who laughs at all moral law and takes what he can get, the Nietzschean. Perhaps it would be better to say the Menckenian, who is a kind of second-rate Nietzschean, who hasn't even the virtue of perverted idealism, which the Nietzschean has. Then there is the cynicism of the weak man or the suffering man who because of his suffering has lost all confidence in any ethical basis of life and wants to be redeemed by a new kind of strategy of hate—communism; and the cynicism of the observer, the detached observer, of the man in the academic chair who looks at all this and insists that man is no more than a sublimated animal. There are these three cynicisms, and finally the hypocrisy, sometimes the unconscious hypocrisy, of the strong man who is a part of this whole game but doesn't know it, and who hides the essential brutality of his life by a pious phrase or even by a pious experience.

Whenever you give up the confidence of the possibility in an ethical life, the possibility of approaching God through goodness, through a moral experience, of climbing the steep ascent to heaven by peril, toil, and pain, you will have to organize your life upon some kind of basis, you will have to center it in some kind of obsession. If you will not worship God in goodness, you will probably worship some incidental function or process of your life. We human beings don't happen to be as simple as animals are. Bovine serenity is a heaven that is closed to us. We have to assemble our parts, and as we assemble them it is inevitable that we should sometimes center our life around some casual function, around some incidental passion which has its proper place but does not belong on the top.

When you look at modern civilization you will find that that is what we have been doing, integrating individual personality and society itself around some of these concepts and ideas and functions.

First of all, our religion is a religion of power. We cannot see God because we worship power. That curious sense of frustration that every man has and that comes out of his confusion and that, when properly led, leads to repentance, that curious sense of frustration that every modern man has, he overcomes by grasping more power and saying, "See how big I am!" Primitive man picked up a stick and said, "Now admire me!" When modern man suffers a loss of self-esteem, he buys a bigger car and "steps on it." That picture of a man sitting in a car and "stepping on it" is the picture of modern civilization, by the way—and one must add that the man is slightly intoxicated, which is not a cute reference to the violation of the Volstead Act, for his intoxication is something more profound than that. Modern civilization is a man slightly intoxicated, driving a high-powered car, usually running over somebody.

We worship physical power for its own sake. In my city they have just announced that we are going to have the highest building in the world, eighty-five floors. Forty of these floors are going to be devoted to a garage, and all of it is going to be done in the finest Gothic architecture. That again is a picture of modern civilization—the eighty-five floors, Titanism—with forty floors for the garage, as Aristophanes would say, the worship of the great god Whirl. And the Gothic architecture! Modern civilization preening itself with standards of another age that it did not develop and cannot altogether understand.

We worship power not only for its own sake; but for the sake of enslaving our fellows. The trouble with the average man, even with the righteous man, is that he does not understand what Bossuet has called the prodigious malignity of the human soul, how far we will go to live off other

people. Almost all of us are a part of a system of mutual exploitation that works fairly well, and particularly so in America, partly because there is so much wealth that everybody gets a little; and if we outrage personality by this mutual exploitation, we compensate people by bestowing upon them the dubious blessings of a radio or an automobile. We live off other people. We live off them because we want special privileges at their expense, and we live off them because we love the sense of power. On the whole, I think it is the masculine soul that wants the power and the feminine soul that wants the privilege that comes from power. It is a kind of parasitism that is a part of human life and that destroys religion. For however authentic the religious emotion may be, if there is any kind of critical intelligence in the world anywhere, somebody is bound to discover that you cannot love God if you do not love your fellow men and that you cannot love your fellow men if you hold them in your grasp without their consent. You can't love a man who is in your power. The best you can do is to pity him, and pity is a kind of compound between love and contempt. And because we cannot love, we do not know God. We have not realized sufficiently that our faith must be relevant to our moral experience and that finally a civilization which is built upon the worship of power will destroy our faith, the faith of the man who suffers because of us, and even the faith of the detached observer.

This is a civilization which when it is overcome by this sense of frustration grasps not only for power but for physical comfort. It sublimates its body not only by making it larger but by pillowing it in down and scenting it with perfume and making physical life as easy as possible. We are exhausting every ingenuity of the American mind—for in this respect America again is Western civilization raised to the *n*th degree—we exhaust the ingenuity of the mind in order to make life physically more comfortable. We are obsessed with physical things. It adds to our self-respect,

which we are always losing because of the moral confusion of our lives. We haven't an idea as a civilization or as a generation of what is meant by that admonition, "Take heed, and beware of covetousness, for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of things which he possesseth." Perhaps it is nicely illustrated by the fact that the American people are at the present time $5,000,000,000 in debt. They have mortgaged their future to the extent of $5,000,000,000 that they may possess things for which they cannot pay immediately. You have the slogan "a dollar down, and the rest the rest of your life."

Sex worship is a part of this worship of the sensual, of the incidental, things in life. Isn't it an interesting fact that a civilization which imagines itself emancipated from the worship of God should fall into this new and yet old kind of worship with every moving-picture theater a shrine and with a phallic symbol too, every chance movie actor, perhaps a Rudolph Valentino, the symbol. It is because we can't center our life upon an ethical principle that we fall inevitably into the terrible perdition of centering it upon some incidental function.

This is a civilization which worships not only power and comfort, but which has made supreme the worship of its group. Nationalism is really finally the religion of modern man—and it is based on the discovery that it is difficult to be ethical; and that the easiest way out is to compound all of our unethical conduct and delegate our vices to the largest possible group.

Patriotism is a high form of altruism. "God gave all men all the earth to love, but since our hearts are small, ordained one spot should prove beloved over all." Patriotism is a high form of altruism. It is even a religion at the shrine of which all of us can worship, but nationalism is a cult which insists that a group never has to be ethical, that because you are ethical toward the group, the group is absolved from responsibility for ethical conduct. Nationalism

is at once the religion and the curse of modern civilization, and that does not mean only nationalism in the narrow sense; that means the unethical conduct of all groups; the unethical conduct of the class group is as bad as the unethical conduct of the race group. Sometimes it seems to me as though Western civilization had only two religions, nationalism and communism, and Christianity were existing only by virtue of a covert or overt connivance with nationalism.

Look at our own country; we are all good people in America. I don't suppose there is any nation as pious as we are, and yet I ask you whether there is one single consideration that at the present time is determining America's attitude toward the world except the fact that we are rich and that Europe is poor, that the world needs us and that we don't need the world. Just a week ago forty Columbia professors gave out a statement in regard to the war debts, a very closely reasoned statement, which incidentally suggests the kind of service which professors ought to be rendering public opinion. The newspapers commented upon it, and this is the report we received from Washington:

"According to one of the most important administration advisers, reduction or cancellation of debts will never come except public sentiment favors it, and public sentiment will not so form unless it is apparent that the payment of debts may injure American trade."

That is the gospel, not of America, but of modern civilization.

I am reminded of the words of Henry Adams in "The Education of Henry Adams." He was his father's private secretary, his father being Abraham Lincoln's minister in London. Observing the devious ways of English statesmen, watching particularly Gladstone, the good and virtuous Gladstone, detecting Gladstone telling his father all kinds of lies, until he determined whether it was expedient for

England to support the Abolition movement, Henry Adams comes to the cynical conclusion, "As I look at men in their mass action, I am convinced that they are always prompted not by conscience but by interests, and I have come to the conclusion that morality is always a private and a costly luxury."

It so happens that that private morality is not really the sphere in which we are living today. We see the whole world, and the whole world sees us, in all relationships and even if we built up the most marvelous technique of self-deception, we can't finally hide it from ourselves if we are trying as nations to live off one another. In that kind of world what is more inevitable than that people should be cynical, particularly when the unethical national group has more power than it ever had before? We have enough power so that we can step on China; we have enough power so that we can grab oil in Persia; we have the power and the immoral intention as groups, all groups. There are none of us who are virtuous in that respect.

You see, finally, we cannot know God if we will not make a desperate attempt in all human relationships to put our life upon an ethical basis, which is nothing else than what Jesus said in the words, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

I do not say that it is impossible to believe in God when you live in a civilization like that. I say that the price of believing in God is to detach yourself as much as possible from that kind of civilization and to develop an ethical intelligence which makes moral action possible in all human relationships.

Good will is not enough to develop an ethical life in this complex world. We have to go through the tortuous process of thinking our way through the complexities.

If we have developed that critical-mindedness which so easily issues in cynicism, we must, on the other hand, develop again a simple-mindedness which knows how to hope

and believe in defiance of some immediate evidence, to hope that bad people may yet be good, and that the Kingdom of God, though always defeated, will always be victorious ultimately. In the college world, do you know that Christianity is always being born because you are intelligent enough to be ethical, and Christianity is always dying because too much sophistication accompanies intelligence.

Jesus put that wonderfully in two little stories that were put in juxtaposition, I think, by an insight of the gospel writer rather than by the incidents themselves.

One man came to Jesus and said, "Master, I will follow you wherever you go." Jesus transfixed him and said, "You don't know what that means. You have not thought your way through the problem of the Christian life. The foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests but the Son of man hath not where to lay His head. You don't know what the Christian life means." Another man came and said, "Master, I will follow you, but first let me bury my father. I have certain family loyalties. There is a conflict of loyalties and I want to satisfy the smaller loyalty first." And Jesus said, in effect, "There are always so many excellent reasons for doing less than the best when you think about it." To the one man he said, "You will be a better Christian if you think a little more," and to the other one, "You will be a better Christian if you think a little less."

"Blessed are the poor in spirit," blessed are the simple-minded, "for theirs is the Kingdom of God." We need a critical intelligence, we need simple-mindedness, but finally we need courage to detach ourselves from this world.

The student generation that preceded us received its spiritual power from the great adventure of foreign missions. It was willing to expatriate itself from America in order to build the Kingdom of God in the far ends of the earth. I would not have its work undone; we cannot retreat from the lines that it has established. I glory in the mission

enterprise in foreign lands and I glory in the by-product of the foreign-missionary enterprise which is the Christianizing of the Christian as well as of the non-Christian world. But the student generation before us has simply set us a new task. Our business is no longer merely to Christianize the nominally non-Christian world but to Christianize the world which is nominally Christian. Western civilization, you see, has become a missionary territory, and it is our business to expatriate ourselves not only from America but from the world and to learn again what those simple words mean, "Be ye not conformed to this world, but be ye rather transformed by the renewing of your mind." The price that we will have to pay for knowing God is to disassociate ourselves from that part of the world of men which is only a projection of the world of nature. Part of this world that we have been idealizing is nothing but the world of nature. We have prided ourselves upon conquering nature. What we did was to arm nature—the nature in us—and as we discover that this world of man is just a part of nature and that some of its historical incidents are just the fight of herds with one another, we realize that the price that we pay for fellowship with a good God is complete disassociation from that kind of world. Of course, that means the cross.

The slogan of the last generation of students was "The evangelization of the world in this generation." I do not say that this new slogan was not also theirs, but in a particular sense our slogan must be, "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, take up his cross and follow me."

III

HOW JESUS FOUND FELLOWSHIP WITH GOD

HENRY SLOANE COFFIN

A few weeks ago, when Sir Alan Cobham completed his sensational flight from Britain to Australia and back, an Indian maharajah, who chanced to witness the popular demonstration which welcomed the aviator, remarked that it seemed strange that no public recognition was made of God, by whose providence so signal a feat had come to pass. Such a comment from a non-Christian should give us pause. To a very large number of people at present God seems a negligible factor in human affairs. They assume a mind or a force back of the universe, its source and the bond of its unity today. They take God for granted, much as they take the moon for granted; they establish no more personal relations with him than they do with the moon.

Our situation is not unlike that which prevailed in the Palestine in which Jesus was born. The institutions of religion in synagogue and temple were maintained. People accepted ethical standards which presuppose a righteous God. Few questioned His existence. But so far as His doing anything on the earth, He was a memory and a hope—a memory, for they recognized that He had played a mighty part in the nation's past, and had meant much to devout folk through the ages; a hope, for they were looking for a great day when He would dramatically disclose Himself and usher in a golden age of justice and peace. Fellowship with God was a tradition and an anticipation; very few people found Him in the present and had first-hand experience of Him.

There is a saying of our Lord's, in the version in which

Luke records it, which may contain an autobiographical reminiscence. He uses the metaphor of a sycamore tree uprooted and planted in the sea and bid to grow and bear fruit in such uncongenial surroundings. Was he recalling how his own spirit felt in the thought of his time? He told a would-be follower that while foxes had holes and birds their nests, his soul was homeless. But he rooted and grounded himself in God, he found Him home, and invariably thought of Him by a name taken from the home—Father.

What are the obstacles men must overcome today if they are to repeat any such experience? One is indifference. No one ever reaches God who is not hungry for Him. We are living in an age of unprecedented material development and in the most fabulously prosperous land under the sun. It is inevitable that men should feel themselves self-sufficient. When they are managing so successfully by themselves, why bother about God? It is only the individual with whom life is going hard, or that rare man who takes the wrongs and injustices of others on his conscience, who becomes eager for God.

While Jesus never knew the enervating atmosphere of material luxury, it was when he went up the Jordan and associated himself with that tatterdemalion group of penitent and aspiring folk—harlots, oppressive soldiers, grafting tax-gatherers, religious leaders smitten with a sense of insincerity—and received with them the symbol of public repentance, that God became to him an empowering presence.

A second barrier in our time is the scientific approach to life. Our scientists have been occupied in discovering the laws of the universe—laws of physics and chemistry, laws of economics and of eugenics, laws of psychology and human behavior. Many people feel that so long as they know these laws and live in harmony with them, they do their duty by mankind, and it will be well with them. They

do not see where there is any room or need for a personal tie with God. He is the mind or force which works in these ways: to keep them is life, to disobey them death. They have no sense of partnership with God, of direct guidance from Him, of receiving renewals of life in comradeship with him.

Jesus faced a not dissimilar legalism. God had given Israel a law; that law was written in the Pentateuch and interpreted by the traditions of the scribes. Let a man know and observe the law in all its details, and it would be well with him. The law stood between man and God. God was the lawgiver and no stress was laid on personal relations with Him, only on conformity to His laws. Jesus kept the law, except where he found it outworn and inhuman, but he broke through legalism and became a companionable Son of the Most High. He was interested in a direct touch with One who cared and toiled and loved.

A third barrier in our time is nationalism. The Great War was a clash of national interests. Since the armistice the nations have been no less aggressive. In the small countries of Central Europe, in China, Japan, India, in Fascist Italy and Spain, in our own insistence upon a hundred per cent Americanism, nationalism is rampant. The strongest factor in keeping this country out of the League and in causing it to demand its own reservations before entering the World Court is a proud and self-willed patriotism which assumes the superior character of our own national morals. We ought not to be involved in these hampering international arrangements, because America must be free to have her own infallible way. In such a nationalistic day God is felt to be and interpreted as being Anglo-Saxon or Fascist or one hundred per cent American. His world-wide sympathy, His all-inclusive interest, His love for every man, are unshared. We have anti-Oriental, or anti-Semitic, or anti-something prejudices which bar us from genuine companionship in thought and feeling and purpose with Him.

Jesus faced the barrier of nationalism. It did not occur to the Jew of his day that God could be as interested in other peoples as He was in Israel. Theoretically, he believed Him to be the God of the whole earth, but the Jew's preoccupation with his own nation, his sense of superiority to outsiders, his cordial dislike of his oppressors, made him feel that God was particularly bound up in Israel and somewhat indifferent to what befell other peoples. When Jesus had in mind "the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them," when he pictured men coming from the East and the West and sitting down with patriarchs in the Kingdom, when he prayed "Our Father," he surmounted nationalism and was comrade of the God whose care and love go out to all His children.

A fourth obstacle in our day is to be found in the class feeling and in the class divisions which enter into our religious life. People of one set go to one church, people of another set flock to a second. Masses of working folk are outside all churches. Only an occasional, rare Christian attempts to get the point of view of a Communist or of a man whose political or social sympathies differ from his own. The fact that for the time being our land is unbelievably prosperous makes the average citizen smugly complacent and dogmatically confident that things as they are are things as they ought to be, and extremely impatient of any reckless wight who suggests rocking the smoothly gliding boat. His class-bound mind and contented soul bar him from intimacy with a God whose sympathies are as wide as those of Jesus, who is especially interested in the unprivileged—"the lost" in the struggle for moral excellence —and who for their sakes is eager for change into a more loving arrangement of human affairs.

In Jesus' day religion had become the religion of a class. To be godly meant to follow with scrupulous care the thousand and one prescriptions of the law; and only those with leisure for study and for pilgrimages could fulfil the devout

ideal. Artisans and day laborers had neither sufficient time nor education to be really "righteous." The Pharisees, who, in his time, may have numbered about six thousand, were persons in comfortable circumstances who looked down on the proletariat, "This people that knoweth not the law are accursed." They held themselves apart from the rabble and particularly from the disreputable—prostitutes, tax-farmers, non-Jews. This class confinement and snobbery thwarted companionship with an all-caring and all-redeeming Father. Jesus, with extraordinary sympathy, felt with all sorts and conditions, as his parables witness—laborers employed and unemployed, prodigal sons, and despised Samaritans. That he found it possible to associate with those outside the social pale, to be accessible to them, to alter them remains a miracle as wonderful as any reported of him—for who of us dreams of doing anything like it? He was comrade of the unrestricted and transforming love of God.

Indifference, legalism, nationalism, class consciousness—our barriers today to fellowship with God—Jesus confronted and surmounted.

And how did he accomplish this? He used means to establish and enlarge his communion with the Invisible; and they were not novel means. The very fact that in every generation they emerge as the chief means by which men get at their desired spiritual reinforcements ought to commend them to us. They were, in his day as in ours, the time-honored means of drawing on resources from the Unseen; but while thousands were using them, he used them with such sincerity and freshness that they yielded to him what others missed.

One was the organized religious institution—the Church. Jesus had many criticisms of its leaders. He thought the Church emphasized things trifling and forgot things of first importance. He must often have been bored by the unenlightened addresses to which he listened in synagogues.

He probably found much of the ritual at the Temple obsolete; and he must have felt some of the prayers in the synagogue unworthy of the Father he knew. He was, however, a devotee of the Church of his time—he went regularly to its synagogues; he kept its great festivals at Jerusalem; he was eager to contribute his spiritual experience to the Church's work; and he taught at Nazareth, Capernaum, and in any synagogue which opened to him. Only a man who cares intensely will subject himself to danger and fierce opposition; and Jesus risked these when he cleansed the temple court of traffickers. He hazarded his life for the sake of the religious institution. Through the spiritual heritage which it handed down and made available, through the teaching and worship of its synagogues which had been his from childhood, through the chance it afforded for fellowship with earnest folks who were waiting "for the consolation of Israel," through the doors which it opened to him as a teacher to impart his convictions, he found the living God and had personal experience with Him.

Every indictment which can be lodged against the Church today is paralleled in the situation in the Jewish Church of the first century. Its theology is often behind the age; its services lack reality; its outlook is narrow; it fails to appeal to many classes in the community; its dull preachers try the patience of the thoughtful; its insincere leaders disgust the earnest; its constantly grinding machinery produces scant results in changed lives; its divisions are due to outworn differences or to ridiculous trifles. What of the quarrels of Sadducee and Pharisee, or scribes of the school of Hillel and scribes of the school of Shammai? The Church of our times is no worse than the Church of his, and he stayed in it, and worshipped in it, and staked his life to improve it. And through the imperfect Church of our time there comes a rich spiritual inheritance—whatever each possesses he owes to it. Through its imperfect fellowship men are laid hold of by Christ and grow larger

souls. Through its imperfect organization they can make and some are making their contribution to the transformation of the world. To give it up in disgust is not to follow Jesus; it is to cut oneself off from its heritage, to miss the enriching fellowship he had with kindred believers, to fail to use a well-recognized means for expressing oneself in service for the inspiration and redemption of those committed to our generation.

A second was the conserved and selected religious experience in the Bible. Jesus and the Pharisees read the same rolls and got out of them very different things. They read through the glasses of predecessors; he read with his own eyes. He did not accept everything he read; he boldly threw over many things: Moses' treatment of divorce was obsolete and the law of revenge misrepresented the God of love. Yet passage after passage found him, and through the Bible God spoke to him. The voice in his soul at the baptism, the answers he gave to tempting ideals of how his work might be done, the principles on which he settled questions, the prayers in which he uttered his soul's longings, the guidance which took him to Calvary—all came from his Bible. He brought a discerning judgment and a responsive conscience to these old books, and let them speak to Him. Whenever he heard clearly the message of God, his soul made answer. He lived on God's word as the bread of heaven.

Here in our Bible is the still richer treasury of God's self-disclosure to many men preserved in writings which are incomparable literature. It is interesting to learn what scholars have to tell us about the dates of the various books, about the way in which they probably were put together, about their peculiarities of thought and style. Such matters are of trifling moment when one goes to the Bible to get resources for oneself. Then all that we need to do is to read, putting aside what seems antiquated or irrelevant, and letting passages of timeless truth and enduring power get hold of our conscience and fill our hearts. God becomes

again for us a habitation whereunto we may continually resort, a fountain of life, the strength of our heart, the sun and shield, our exceeding joy, the supply of our every need as we address ourselves to the tasks of our time. When we go to the Bible, waiting to find God speaking to us through it, we are not disappointed, but we hear and recognize His message. That message does for us all that it did for Jesus, supplying guidance, reinforcement, fellowship with believing spirits, openings into the mind and heart of the living God.

A few weeks ago the newspapers carried the story of ancient formulæ tested afresh in the laboratories of the University of Pennsylvania. The late Professor Newbold had translated the works of Roger Bacon, a scientific pioneer of six centuries ago, and had deciphered his formula for the production of copper salts. He had handed it to a chemist, as it meant nothing to him, and the chemist had tried it and found it worked. Here in the Bible are formulæ for extracting from the invisible the resources which we most need for our spirits. Try them, for ten thousand times ten thousand tell us they work.

A third time-honored means which Jesus used was prayer. He did not define just what he meant by it. He unfolded his life with all its problems and interests to his Father, drew on Him without limit, looked and listened to Him. He prayed before making important choices. He prayed as he prepared for ordeals. He prayed when he was undertaking anything difficult. He prayed when he was tired. He prayed for those dear to him and those committed to his care. He prayed at his wits' end when with ebbing life he knew no other recourse but to God. His prayers were voyages of discovery, in which the mysterious Invisible became more real, more enriching, more trustworthy and responsive to him.

You and I discuss prayer. We question certain kinds of prayer. We set limits to what we think prayer can achieve.

When Jesus' disciples wanted to discuss prayer, and asked him to teach them how to pray, he simply set them to praying. He warned them against unreality in prayer, but apart from that one warning he let them pray with him and set them to praying for themselves. He knew that prayer is not something which can be explored in a discussion group; it can be explored only by praying. "Praying," said the mystic Novalis, "is in religion what thinking is in philosophy; praying is making religion." Let a man start wherever he happens to be and go as far as he can in prayer. He will find his own way. Or rather he will find himself in God and becoming possessed by Him.

The crowning means which Jesus employed to maintain his enriching contact with God was uncompromising devotion to His purpose, as that purpose became clear to him through his Church and his Bible and his prayer. We see it when he dedicates himself at the Jordan, feeling himself one of a sinful people, and receiving the baptism of repentance. It was then that to him the heavens seemed open. We see it in the struggle in the wilderness, where he faces lower ideals of the course he may take and refuses them. We see it supremely when he has been mastered by the strange figure of the servant of the Lord who bears the sin of many and pours out his soul into death for their deliverance. Apparently, the prophet who drew that figure was not thinking of some individual to come, but of the nation. Certainly nobody in Jesus' day thought of that figure as portraying what God's chosen representative would do. But this ideal gripped his conscience. This seemed to him the career for God's representative because it was most like God Himself. Grim, terrible destiny! But the method of creating a new race! "He shall see seed. He shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied." And steadfastly Jesus set his face, and went his way until he was hanging in agony at Golgotha.

We think we wish for our time the resources of Jesus.

They have never been given to any man through the centuries save to him who, like his Master, abandoned himself to the purpose of God as that became clearer and clearer to him. It has always been a purpose which other people could not fully understand or agree with. It has always been a purpose which conflicted with current ideals and involved a sore conflict. It has always been a purpose which called on a man to bear the sins of his generation, to battle with them, to suffer for them, and by what he endures and achieves to share the redemptive task of Christ which is the very life of God Himself. We hear Jesus crying "Forsaken!" from the cross, and asking his baffled "Why?" And we cannot help feeling that in this bewildered hour he was making his supreme discovery and entering most enrichingly into fellowship with the Eternal Spirit. Here he received and most plainly revealed the fullness of God.

Through the centuries, men of every race and nation and condition have been coming to the Crucified, and coming to those who have shown even faint resemblance to his spirit; and through him and these followers of his they have found resources for their personal needs and for the special struggle of their day, and have been able to say: "Our sufficiency is of God."

IV

MODERN SCIENCE AND THE ACCESSIBILITY OF GOD

G. A. Studdert Kennedy

I am neither an expert scientist nor an expert anything else that I ever could discover. For the task that I have been commissioned to undertake that is partly a disqualification, a disqualification for the discussion of the accessibility of God in the light of modern science; it is a disqualification because, of course, it is impossible for me to speak with the authority that an expert rightfully commands in his own sphere. But it is perhaps a disqualification that is partly compensated for by an advantage, for the very essence of science in the modern significance of the term is specialized and abstract knowledge. Science broadly means the ordering and unification of all knowledge whatsoever, but the modern significance of the term means and essentially entails abstraction from reality and special concentration upon one part of that abstraction.

Every science works within the limits of its hypothesis. There is no science until there is an hypothesis upon trial. As Sir Henry Jones remarks in his Gifford lectures, "A faith that inquires." Almost inevitably one whose life is spent in testing an abstract hypothesis is likely to fall into the belief that it can be made to cover the whole of concrete reality. You have, therefore, what Sir Henry Jones again calls the most fruitful source of error and confusion. "There is no more fruitful source of confusion and error," he says, "than the use in one branch of knowledge of modes of thought and categories of speech which are only applicable to another."

The scientist who specializes is of necessity partly dis-

qualified for being an expert on religion if his life is devoted entirely to science, and certainly his standing as a scientist does not give him any standing as an authority upon religious experience. It is likely to turn out like the timber merchant who was taken by an artist friend of his to look at a perfectly glorious forest in the splendor of its autumn clothing at the setting of the sun. After they had stood in silence for some time, the artist turned to his friend and said, "Is it not glorious?" His friend replied, "Yes, it is glorious timber. I guess that, counting transportation and felling, it would work out at about eighty cents a foot." He was looking at the whole in the light of his abstraction from it.

Religion is the science of the concrete in particular as material science is the science of the abstract in general. Yet science and religion have a common route and are rooted in a common experience, and for a very long part of the way they seem to meet and move along the same road. Their common experience arises from the fact that, as William James says, "There is in human consciousness a sense of reality other than the perceiving self, a feeling of objective presence, a perception of what we may call something there, more deep and more general than any of the particular senses by which the current psychology imposes characteristic realities to be originally revealed."

Science and religion are alike responses to the stimulus of the universe conceived as such. There is I and there is that vast other than I.

One of the most unforgettable religious experiences of my life was simply standing alone on a moor with nothing but the heather and the sea around me and the stars above me and becoming profoundly conscious of two realities—I and that which is not I over against me. And that which is not I acts as a stimulus upon me, upon the I. Both science and religion are responses to that stimulus; they are both answers to the challenges of the universe.

I think we get at the root of the matter most clearly when we think, as I thought that night, of the universe set over against me as a vast book, a book that I hold in my hand. Here am I, and there is the book; here am I, and there is that vast universe set over against me. It is written in a language that I only partially and very haltingly understand. The order of its parts, the letters, the words, the sentences, the chapters, appear to be confused, and the meaning of it is dim and obscure; yet that book challenges me to read it.

I can adopt, broadly, three attitudes toward it. I can look at it and because I see so much in it that is evil, so much in it that expresses cruelty and tragedy and the bitterness of things (and I am not likely to be one of those who shut their eyes to the existence of the cruelty and the bitterness and the evil of the world! I have been trained in a hard school and have seen deviltry enough to turn any man's soul sick), I can say, "This damned thing has no meaning in it whatever," and I can chuck it away from me. Then I am an atheist. The essence of atheism is to say, "This world means nothing; it is a tale told by a fool, full of song and fury and signifies nothing." That is one response I can make to the book.

I can say, "It may have a meaning, but I can't understand it. I give it up." Then I am an agnostic. I can still take an interest in the collocation of its parts, for science is still open to the agnostic; I can still investigate the relation of the letters to the letters and the sentences to the sentences and the words to the words, but I can say, "As to a meaning, as to a message, as to a purpose, it may have one but I can't make it out, and I give it up."

Or I can say, "Despite the fact of the bitterness and the evil and the apparent confusion in it, I believe it has a meaning and a message, and I am going on until I find it. It has so much that is lovely in it, it has so much that is fair, that I won't give up until I find a meaning in it that is as fair as its fairest, as clean as its cleanest, as high as its highest."

And then I am a theist. For a theist is a man who says, "I believe that the world has a meaning and that I can discover it." And scientific thought and religious thought with regard to that book, although their aims and objects are different, the one seeking to discover the meaning, the other seeking to discover the right ordering of the parts that make it up, move along a common road. They both begin with a period of observation, of brooding over the facts. Whether it be Bunyan that broods over the facts of the soul or Newton that broods over the facts of the stars, whether it be Faraday that broods over the facts of physics or St. Francis that broods over the facts of sorrow and unhappiness, brooding is the beginning of life—partly what the student ought to be doing, brooding over the facts of life, looking at them, pondering them, saying, "What do they mean? What do they mean?" That is the first step in all thought, scientific or religious, the brooding over the facts.

Then there comes the moment of illumination, the moment when the scientist has gathered together and ordered and classified an enormous number of facts that apparently were before unconnected and uncoordinated, and broods over them and says, "I see!" And his hypothesis is born. That is the greatest moment in all scientific discovery, the moment when the man cries, "I see!" That is a moment of pure imaginative illumination. In the religious life it is conversion; in the scientific life it is the birth of an hypothesis. From an intellectual point of view, when I first saw my Redeemer, I first came to my hypothesis about life from a purely intellectual point of view, and my right to believe in my Redeemer is, from an intellectual point of view, my right to hold an hypothesis as to the ultimate meaning of life. As there is no science without an hypothesis on trial, there is no life without a faith by which it can be lived. A life that has no vital hypothesis upon which it is based, no faith to give it meaning, is a thing of shreds

and patches, an apology for life. If there is in this life nothing for which you would gladly die, then you are not living, you are merely postponing death.

So along the light of observation, then, with the moment of imagination, both movements of thought proceed, and then there comes the third stage of the testing of the hypothesis, the living of it out, the application of it to fact, the saying, "This will not fit, that will fit. That thing must wait until I see deeper into the relationship. I must put it off. But this does fit." The gradual modification of the religious hypothesis thus changes in form but not in essence.

Einstein has modified but he has not dethroned Newton. Modern theology has changed from the ancient, but in its essence it is the same. It is still the same hypothesis, but modified. The new scientific discoveries do not destroy the old, nor would the new have been possible without the old.

"I come not to destroy the law, but to fulfil."

The New Testament and the glory of the Christ grew out of the strange, contorted beginning of the old. The hypothesis changes and is modified, but it is implicit in that which goes before.

So science and religion seem to me to move along the common road by which all thought must move, through observation to illuminative imagination, then on to the road of testing and proving and of life. Moreover, they start from common assumptions, they start from the assumption that the universe, the book to be read, is one book. Behind all science lies the conscious or unconscious assumption that every event in the world can be related to every other event, and at the back this vast thing is a universe and not a pluriverse. Science began with the Greeks, who moved intellectually to the idea of the unity of good as the Jews moved by inspiration to the idea of the universal unity of God. Both the inspiration of the prophet and the intellectual illumination of the sage have moved to the idea of the universe, and all science has at the back of it the conscious

or unconscious assumption that the universe is a universe and not a pluriverse.

Secondly, they have behind them the common assumption that the book is readable, rational, that it can be understood, that it has an order running through the relation of its parts, that it is not the result of mere arbitrary contingencies. Science makes that assumption, religion makes that assumption.

Thirdly, they are common in their assumption of this, that the book is worth reading, and that it is so far good. No scientist who believed that it wasn't worth while trying to study the relation of the letters and the sentences and the words in this book would bother his head doing it. Consciously or unconsciously at the back of his mind there is the assumption this labor of reading the book is worth while. And so both come to the assumption that the universe is accessible to man, that the universe can enter into man, because a thing can't be understood unless it is accessible. I can't understand you unless you are accessible to me; I can't say that is beautiful unless the beauty has passed into me, unless I have partaken of it. So science and religion both rest upon the assumption that that which is at the heart of the universe is accessible to man and can become part of him; and on that assumption that the book is one book, that it is rational, and that it is good enough to be worth investigating, science and religion rest, and that is an assumption that the universe is accessible to man.

On those assumptions science is working at the relations of the parts to the parts, of the letter to the letter, in chemistry, in physics, which has to do with the elements; of the word to the word in zoology and botany, the relation of living creatures to living creatures; of sentence to sentence in sciences like biology and anthropology; of chapter to chapter in sciences like geology, paleontology, and embryology. Under the vast hypothesis of evolution it is arrang-

ing the book in its proper spacial and chronological order, and a glorious work it is. It is spreading out before us the whole of the vast book of the universe, arranged in the proper order of its parts, from the very minutest particles and invisible positive and negative electric actions and reactions, from the very intimate study of the minute to the study of vast chapters in the evolution of life, arranging it all in its order. That is the work of science.

Science, however, does not say, nor does it profess to say, one word about the meaning of the book, about its value, about its purpose, about its beauty, about its goodness or its truth. Those things are not for the scientist; he has nothing to do with them. He has one absolute value that he refuses to surrender; he will not surrender his quest of truth. He says, "I will not surrender any part of the universe to mere contingency and chance. All may not be love, but all is law, although we may not understand the law."

The scientist utterly refuses, despite the fact that there are many things which apparently are lawless and without order, to believe that they are ultimately lawless and ultimately without order. He says, "I will eventually bring them within rational understanding and I will not surrender my belief that they are rational."

Religion says, "Neither will I surrender my quest for goodness. There are things which contradict beauty, there are things which contradict goodness, but I don't believe they can permanently contradict it, and I will bring it all under the category of beauty and goodness as you bring it under the category of truth. I will find a meaning in it, however hard it may appear to be now, and I will not surrender the quest. I will not ask the scientist to surrender his quest of truth. He must go on and on and on, hammering at it, and I cannot surrender my quest of beauty and goodness."

This assumes that God is accessible to man. The author reveals himself through the book. There is something coming through the book to me, and that something the scientist

believes to be rational; I believe it to be beautiful and good, and therefore personal, because beauty and goodness are attributes of personality. Beauty lives not in the eyes of the beholder or in the thing beheld, but in a certain sympathy between the beheld and the beholder. It is an attribute of personality. I believe that there is a person or a superperson, for religion has never held that God is merely personal; it has always held that He is superpersonal and a mystery of complete impersonality.

If we are to conceive of the relation of the Creator to the creation, we cannot conceive of it better than as the relation of a poet to a poem, of an author to a book, of a speaker to a speech; he is immanent and yet transcendent, expressing himself, yet never fully expressed, as I am in this speech. God knows I am trying to say what I believe to be the truth, but I cannot say it and have never said it in my life. The ultimate truth that I have in me can't be said; it is ineffable; it just strikes me dumb.

God give me speech,
In mercy touch my lips.
I cannot bear Thy beauty and be still,
Watching the red-gold majesty that tips
The crest of yonder hill
And out to sea smites on the sails of ships
That flame like drifting stars across the deep,
Calling their silver comrades from the sky,
As long and ever longer shadows creep
To sing their lullaby
And hush the tired eyes of earth to sleep.

The radiancy of glory strikes me dumb,
Yet cries within my soul for power
To raise such miracles of music as would sum
Thy splendor in a phrase and store it
Safe for all the years to come.

O God, who givest songs too sweet to sing,
Have mercy on this servant's feeble tongue
In sacrificial sorrowing,
And grant that songs unsung

Except as at Thy mercy seat
May bring new light into the darkness and sad eyes,
New tenderness to stay this stream of tears,
New rainbows from the sunshine of surprise
To guide men down the years
Until they cross the last long bridge of sighs.

I was reciting and writing that as the sun went down behind the blue Welsh hills and turned the still red sands of the River Dee into fields of golden glory, and I drank, and drank deep, of God's cup of beauty and tried to say it and was dumb. And as I tried to speak and was dumb, so God tries to speak to His great world and is partly dumb; He is immanent and transcendent over it as I am over my speech and as I am this minute.

So I conceive that God is accessible to mind as a common ground of religion and science, because otherwise truth would be unattainable to science, beauty and goodness unattainable to religion. If the objective universe is impervious to it, then the quest of science and of religion is abortive and there is no basis for thought.

Finally, both rest upon the assumption that the universe is seeking me. Not only do I seek the universe, but the universe is seeking me. The growth of the world is caused, secondarily at any rate, by the action and the reaction of every creature on its environment and of the environment on every living creature. There has been progress if we take the wide, long sweep. You will find that beautifully set out in Julian Huxley's "Essays of a Biologist," the progress from simplicity to multiplicity, from multiplicity to complexity, from complexity to internal adjustment, from internal adjustment to independence of environment and control of the environment, and the gradual progress in the power of mind over matter and freedom over necessity. And this progress is either contingent or miraculous; that is, it is either caused by pure chance, or else it is in the strict sense of the word miraculous—I mean even to modern

science. That is, it is not the result of any powers at present within the ken of man. No one can understand how the changes that have made for the betterment have actually been caused. That which was entirely conditioned by the past has produced something different from the past, and that is supernatural in the strict sense that it is not the result of any natural forces that we at present know of.

But there are several certainties about it. First of all, it takes place through individual living things. There is nothing in scientific investigation that I can find as to the improvement of a species en bloc. There never was any species that improved in its entirety. If species have improved, they have improved through individual creatures in the species, and therefore, although nature appears from one point of view to be careless of the individual, from another point of view she is careless of everything but the individual; in other words, she always works through the individual. The species is improved through the specimen, and the human race is improved through the individual human being. Those survive that correspond best with their environment, but the environment must make for progress in the sense of producing creatures that are of higher and higher value, or else the progress through correspondence with environment would have been impossible.

My improvement, therefore, can take place only by the action of the environment on me and me on the environment, and it also takes place by the action of environment on living things. The environment is not to be conceived of as a dead, fixed thing to which life adapts itself, but as a dynamic, energetic, creative thing which demands adaptation. Life is seeking a crab to make a perfect crab; life is seeking an oyster to make a perfect oyster; and life is seeking me to make a perfect me. I do not believe that God loves me differently from the way He loves a crab or an oyster or a mollusk, only the life He has to impart to a crab is a crab life, and He may be evolving better crabs, I don't know, at

any rate the movement is so slow that I can't see it. But if He is evolving better crabs, He is working with individual crabs. There is some crab that pinches God's toe harder than the other and therefore climbs up, and it is so with man. The environment and the ultimate meaning of the environment is God seeking every individual living thing and seeking me.

Secondly, both science and religion assume, to that extent, that life is accessible to man because life comes from the effect of the environment and the creature upon each other; because in one sense every living thing is the universe expressed at a point in the terms in which it can express itself.

> There is a world of wonder in this rose.
> God needs it, and His whole creation grows
> To a point of perfect beauty
> In this garden plot.
> He knows the poet's thrill on this
> June morning as he sees
> His will to beauty taking form,
> His word made flesh, and dwelling among men.

If you look at the rose, you see all of the world expressed in one point of blood-red beauty in the mind of God. As the rose expresses the universe, the universe is accessible to the rose. As you express the universe, the universe is accessible to you, and what is behind the universe, its meaning and its purpose, is expressed in you. God is expressed in you, and every man is God expressed at the point and up to the limits of His power of expression, and therefore God both in science and religion is postulated as accessible to man.

Thirdly, both rest on the assumption that I must seek God. Every creature must respond to its environment. The plant must turn to the sun, which is the source of its life, and must express it in terms of vegetable life, and if it does not turn to the sun it dies. The animal must turn to the vegetable, through which it absorbs the energy of the sun, be-

cause it cannot absorb it direct. All life is built on the energy of the sun, but if it does not turn to the source of its life it dies. We must turn to the animal and the vegetable as the source of our physical life, and if we do not turn we die. There is food for our hunger; that is, there is sunshine compressed in animals and vegetables to feed the energy of our physical life. There is food for our hunger, there is wine for our thirst. The world is not a fraud physically.

But there is another life for man; there is the life of thought and the life of æsthetic appreciation and the life of moral standards; there is the life of the soul and of the mind. There is food for that hunger and wine for that thirst and glory for that search. Neither morally, æsthetically, nor rationally is the world a fraud, but man must turn to the source of his higher life, and if he does not turn, he dies. Attending to the source of life is praying.

I remember one of my scientific students, when we used to watch little creatures under the microscope searching for their food with tiny antennae, used to say they were saying their prayers. That is quite true. Every creature prays, that is, it turns to and absorbs the source of its life, for it dies if it does not.

But the life that man has to maintain is higher, and he must turn to the source of that; so he turns to God in prayer. He turns not only to the sun, but to that that lies behind the sun.

There is more behind the sunshine than the sun,
Fiercely flaming in the sky
Like a sneering, sightness eye,
    Seeing not.

There's a voice my spirit knows
In the sunset's golden rose
And the purpose afterglows
    When it's done.

There is speech behind the silence of the night,
When the myriad array,
Wheeling down the milky way,
Marches on to dawning day,
Silver white;

When the velvet of the air,
Like some lovely woman's hair,
Drives the heavy eyes of care
Out of sight.

There is love behind the splendor of the spring,
When the weary winter dies
And the Lord with laughing eyes
Bids the trembling world arise, whispering,
"Did ye think that God was dead?
Nay! My life is warm and red,
And there is no death to dread.
Come and see."

Lord, I pray Thee
Give my spirit eyes to see,
Through the things of time and space,
All the glories of Thy grace,
The commandment of Thy face
Bidding me
Follow on where Christ has trod.
Though I share the grief of God,
Give me strength to sweat my blood,
Lord, for Thee.

That is just how it makes me feel. That is what made me write that. The universe is accessible to me. I can get at that which lies behind. It has a meaning and a purpose and it speaks to the very depths of the soul. That is what makes me long to be an artist, to be a preacher, to be a singer, to be a saviour, to be someone that expresses the essence of it. If that is not real, then the love of my father and my wife and my children and nothing on God's earth is real. It is the whole essence of life, and both science and religion seem to rest upon the fact that the universe and that which lies behind the universe is accessible to man

and that he can absorb it within himself and express it. The purpose of prayer and worship and religious exercises and pondering and thought over the meaning of the world is to help us absorb it into ourselves.

As to certainty in the sense of demonstrable mathematical certainty, there is nothing, because certainty of the mathematical sort is only an abstract thing, and this is the concrete we are dealing with, the whole, the concrete universe, with all its many-sided and its indeterminate variables. Demonstrable mathematical certainty there is not. It is always an adventure, always a challenge, always a great quest. Religion means refusal to surrender in that quest.

How do I know that God is good? I don't. I gamble like a man. I bet my life upon one side in life's great war. I must; I can't stand out; I must take sides. The man who is a neutral in this fight is not a man. He is bulk and body without breath, cold leg of lamb without mint sauce, a fool. He makes me sick! Good Lord! Weak tea, cold slops! I want to live, live out, not wobble through my life somehow and then into the dark. I must have God. This life's too dull without Him, too dull for aught but suicide. What's man to live for else? I'd murder someone just to see red blood. I'd drink myself blind drunk and see blue snakes if I could not look up and see blue sky and hear God speaking through the silence of the stars. How is it proved? It isn't proved, you fool! It can't be proved. How can you prove a victory before it's won? How can you prove a man who leads to be your leader worth the following unless you follow to the death, and out beyond mere death, which is not anything but Satan's lie upon eternal life? Well, God is my leader, and I hold that He is good and strong enough to work His plan and purpose out to its appointed end. I am no fool. I have my reasons for this faith, but they are not the reasonings, the coldly calculated formulæ of thought divorced from feeling. They are true, too true for that. There is no such thing as thought which does not feel, if

it be real thought and not thought's ghost, all pale and sickly, dull with dead conventions, abstract truth which is a lie upon this living, loving, suffering truth that pleads and pulses through my very veins the blue blood of all beauty and the breath of life itself.

I see what God has done, what life in this world is. I see what you see, this eternal struggle in the dark. I see the foul disorders and the filth of mind and soul in which men wallowing like swine stamp on their brothers until they drown in puddles of stale blood and vomitings of their corruption. This life reeks in places, it's true. Yet the scent of roses and of hay, new mown, comes stealing on the evening breeze; and through the markets with the bargaining of cheats who make God's world a den of thieves, I hear sweet bells ring out to prayer and see the faithful kneeling by the Calvary of Christ. I walk in crowded streets where men and women, mad with lust, loose-lipped, and lewd, go promenading down to hell's wide gates. Yet have I looked into my mother's eyes and seen the light that never was on sea or land, the light of love, pure love and true. And on that love I bet my life. I back my mother against a wanton when I believe in God, and can a man do less or more? I have to choose. I back the fragrant scent of life against its foul odors. That is what faith works out.

Finally, I know not why the evil, I know not why the good; both mysteries remain unsolved and both insoluble. I know that both are there. The battle's set and I must fight on this side or that; I can't stand shivering on the bank; I plunge head first. I'd bet my life on beauty, truth, and love, not abstract, but incarnate truth, not beauty's passing shadow, but itself, its very self made flesh, love realized. I bet my life on Christ, Christ crucified. "Behold your God," my soul cries out. He hangs serenely patient in his agony, and turns the soul of darkness into light. I look upon that body, writhing, pierced, and torn with nails, and I see the battle-fields of time, the mangled death, the

gaping wounds, the sweating survivors straggling back, the widows worn and haggard, still dry eyed because their weight of sorrow will not lift and let them weep. I see the ravished maid, the honest mother in her shame. I see all history pass by, and through it all still shines that face, the Christ face, like a star which pierces drifting clouds and tells the truth. They pass, but it remains and shines untouched, a pledge of that great hour which surely comes when storm winds sob to silence, when the fury is spent to silver silence and the moon sails calm and stately through the soundless seas of peace. So through the clouds of Calvary there shines his face, and I believe that evil dies and good lives on and conquers all.

All war must end in peace. These clouds are lies; they cannot last. The blue sky is the truth, for God is love and beauty. Such is my faith, such my reasons for it, and I find them strong enough. And you? You want to argue. Well, I won't. It is a choice, and I choose Christ.

V

FINDING GOD

HOWARD THURMAN

I am tired of sailing my little boat,
Far inside the harbor bar;
I want to go out where the big ships float,
Out on the deep where the great ones are.
And should my frail craft prove too slight
For storms that sweep those billows o'er,
I'd rather go down in the stirring fight
Than drowse to death by the sheltered shore.

Students of this generation are protesting in telling fashion against the bondage of formulae. Yet almost in the same breath there comes a series of questions. Tell me exactly how I can find it. Outline for me the steps. Point out for me the way along which I must go if I may find that for which my heart hungers.

And out of the heart of life I seem to hear a voice which says, "No one can give to you the answer to your questions, but you must live into that answer."

As for myself, I seem to be as a child who walks along the seashore, admiring the pretty pebbles scattered here and there, while the vast ocean of truth stretches out before him, boundless and unexplored. I seem to catch up in my own experience the words of Tennyson, "But what am I, an infant crying in the night, an infant crying for the light, with no language but a cry."

What I shall say to you, therefore, this morning is but a confession of faith and a sense of the direction toward which when I am not myself I seem to go.

The quest for fulfilment is perhaps the most real quest in all the world.

When the Latin poet Horace says that he was not able to sleep because of the pressure of unwritten poetry; when Bunyan tells us in his prologue that he had to put aside the work that he was doing on some sermons and other serious tracts in order to write "Pilgrim's Progress"; when Walter Hampden says that he had to play Hamlet in order to keep a contract with his soul; when a reviewer writes about a concert which Paderewski gave after his five years' dip into politics, "I am confident that I am not listening to a musician who is attempting to play a tune, but I am in the presence of a great catholic spirit which somehow is trying to express itself in a strange, mighty combination of rhythm and tone"; when another critic writing about Roland Hayes, says, "When I hear him sing, I know that I am sitting in the presence of one who sings because he must"; when Ulysses says, "I am a part of all that I have met, yet all experience is an arch where through gleams that untravailed world, whose margin fades forever and forever as I move"; when the Apostle Paul says, "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel"; or when Jesus of Nazareth on that memorable morning in Palestine says, "The spirit of the Lord is upon me because He has anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor"; all of these, each in his own way, is expressing the inner urge which drives him on, and he has no choice but to go, and it may be that the quest for fulfilment is the quest for God; and it may be when I have found that for which my heart hungers, I have found Him.

We have listened from this platform to words which point out essentially the ground or the affirmation which Jesus of Nazareth made about God. We have heard it affirmed that it was His faith and the faith of the speakers, that at the heart of this universe there is personality which is at once the source of life and the goal of life. If that affirmation is valid, then a series of things must follow therefrom, and it is along the line of these that I think the quest for fulfilment, the quest of God, drives one.

First of all, if God is the source of all of life, if out from Him emanate all creation, then there must be an underlying unity for all of them, and wherever one digs in honestly, living up to the limit of the light that one has at the particular time, one does make contact with that unity.

Last Christmas morning I sat before a fire listening to a man from Calcutta, India, tell me a very, very strange but fascinating story. He has been in America fifty-seven years. The first Christmas that he spent in this country he lived at the home of the president of one of the large railroads in America. A few days before this man had thrown the Christmas tree and the decorations over the fence into an alley, and on this particular day about which my friend was talking, some ragged boys in the street had crept up the alley to get the tree and the decorations. As my friend from India looked out at them, he said something happened to him, something like a flash of blinding light, and he saw very clearly what he would have to do if he remained in America another Christmas.

Without saying anything about it, he made his plans, and the next Christmas in the basement of this man's house he had a Christmas tree, and all the ragged boys around in that community were brought in; and for twenty-two years in that city in Texas where he lived, he had this tree.

He has been living in my village now for twenty-five years and every year he has had his tree for the boys in the community who would not have a tree. Last Saturday there were thirty-two of them, six of whom had parents who had once come to this tree to receive gifts, the only gifts that were theirs. As he talked to me about it, he said, "I am not particularly a religious man, but I have learned how to live, and I have found that life for me is conditioned by the kind of life that the boys in this community have, and to me God is very real."

If there is the unity of which we are thinking, the next thing which comes out of that is an essential kinship of all the

creations of all the people in the world, and if that kinship is true, is genuine, then I can never be the kind of person that I ought to be until everybody else is the kind of person that everybody else ought to be. When Jesus of Nazareth says, "I came to seek and to save the lost," He is not only thinking about the need that a certain group of people will have for the kind of life which is his, but he is also reminded of the fact that not only do the lost need him but he needs the lost, and He will never be what He ought to be until they are what they ought to be. It seems to me that what the church tries to say about salvation is that the lost, whoever they are, need to become sensitive to His spirit, yes, but more than that, God needs them, and God will never be what He hungers to be in His world until these people are what they ought to be.

For better or for worse I am tied by the fact of the source of life to all the rest of the people in the world. There is something that each one has to say to me that will make of my life what it cannot be unless that person says it. So I go to the mission field not so much because I am sure that I have something necessarily to give to the person beyond the waters, something so high and so holy, something so different from that which he has, but I go because he has something for me that I must have if I am to be what I ought to be. I put up hospitals for him, I establish training schools for him, I build colleges for him, in order that I may release his bonds and put him in a position to give me the thing that I must have in the world.

If I need everyone else, then by the same process I must be sensitive to the needs of other people.

"O God," I cried, "Why may I not forget?
These halt and hurt in life's hard battle
  Throng me yet.
Am I their keeper? Am I to suffer for their sin?
Would that my eyes had never opened then!"
And the thorn-crowned and patient one replied,
"They thronged me too, I too have seen."

"Thy other children go at will," I said, protesting still,
"They go unheeding. But these sick, these sad, these blind and orphaned,
Yea, those that sin, drag at my heart.
Why is it? Let me rest, Lord. I have tried!"
He turned and looked at me, "But I have died."

"O God, I brought not forth these hosts of needy creatures, struggling, tempest-tossed;
They are not mine."
He looked at them the look of one divine.
He turned and looked at me, "But they are mine."
"O God," I said, "I understand at last.
Forgive me,
And I will henceforth bond-slave be
To thy weakest, vilest ones,
I will not more be free."
He smiled and said, "It is for me."

Sensitiveness to the needs of others. Human need is infinite, but when I respond to it to the limit of my power and become thereby painfully conscious of my own inadequacy, I seem to send my soul through the air and the sky and the sea in quest of an infinite energy that I may release for an infinite task.

Finding God, finding fulfilment in a world like this, I must have demands within myself for the kind of energy that God releases, and that energy must be with reference to a need which calls it forth and which will not let me rest until I find it. This is what Jesus is thinking about, I believe, when He says, "You are to be congratulated if you feel a deep sense of moral and spiritual inadequacy, for yours is the kingdom, the rule, the presence of God." Jesus stands with patient and quiet smile at the gates of the twentieth century, waiting till this lagging student generation catch up with him. Then he will lead the tired and the famishing into his city of love.

A GOD WHO IS THE FATHER OF ALL MANKIND

VI

JESUS' CONCEPTION OF GOD AS THE FATHER OF ALL

CHARLES W. GILKEY

The difference between Jesus' world in the first and ours in the twentieth century is obvious to most of us; but there is one respect in which his age and situation were strikingly like our own. It was a time of suddenly multiplied interracial and interreligious and international contacts; with all the frictions and sensitive abrasions of thin skin that always result, then and now, when shoulders of a different color and shape rub close together.

On our way to India two years ago we spent four days in Nazareth, nestled high among the Galilean hills. Every afternoon we climbed to the hill above the town where a carpenter's boy must have gone very often when the day's work was done. The outlook from that hilltop must have been no small part of his education, not only in the history of his own race and religion, but in the economics and politics of the Mediterranean world. Half the historic scenes of the Old Testament from snowy Hermon to bald Gerizim, from the trench of Jordan to the long whaleback of Carmel, were spread out before him. Back and forth at his feet, across the broad plain of Esdraelon, moved in long, slow lines the camels and caravans of one of the oldest and busiest trade routes in the ancient world, between Egypt and Damascus, and on to distant Babylon. If the village boys climbed the northern hill, they could overlook a highway more brilliant and intriguing still: the Mediterranean to the west, with the long, shining pathway of the setting sun for the ships from distant Greece and Rome; the port

of Acre where their masts were huddled; the highroad from Acre to the eastern frontiers of the Empire, over which the legions marched with their Roman eagles, and noblemen in splendid litters were borne to and from the Greek cities of the Decapolis. Gadara, at least, of those ten cities, with their great amphitheatres and beautiful temples and countless columns, some standing even now, was almost in sight across the Jordan, looking proudly down on Galilee from its eminence of classic architecture, prosperous commerce, and sensuous Greek religion.

Now if you and I as twentieth-century Anglo-Saxons stand on that eminence or still better if we stand under the Arch of Titus in Rome, with its relief of the captured Jewish candlestick being carried in triumphal procession, we can perhaps sense something of the superiority complex with which the practical-minded, cool-headed, heavy-fisted Roman looked down on the factional and fanatical Jew—just as the successful Britisher today declares that the contemplative and other-worldly Indian "hadn't it in him" to make either a good soldier or a man of affairs; or the energetic and complacent one hundred per cent American, with a sweep of his hand toward Europe on the one hand and the Orient on the other, asserts that these "inferior stocks" rate so far below his own 100 par in the racial market that they certainly can't get into God's country, and presumably not into God's Kingdom. And then turn the psychological situation around. Read between the lines of your New Testament and its contemporary writings, and you can plainly feel among these politically subject Jews the same compensating sense of spiritual superiority that the educated Indian has today as he looks out and down upon what he likes to call our militaristic and materialistic West. "After all these things do the Gentiles seek!" And there is a striking parallel to that saying from the Sermon on the Mount, in the word of Gandhi to his fellow Indians: "You will understand our western friends much better, if you will remember

that no matter what they say in creed or in church, money is their real God."

What now did Jesus bring as resources to that world? Note well that he did not bring a new doctrine or philosophy. The Stoics were already doing that with their cosmopolitanism. The man who lives the life of reason is a citizen of the world, lifted above all sundering barriers of race or creed. It was a noble doctrine; but Weber's significant comment on it in his "History of Philosophy" is:

"Its influence cannot be compared with that of Christianity. It was confined to the world of letters and hardly penetrated the masses."

It is not less significant for our own world that meanwhile the Roman statesmen were trying to mobilize religious resources for certain political and social ends of their own—desiring the unifying social fruits of religion without its deep cosmic roots in an experience of God; and their state religion of emperor worship was stillborn. They were putting the cart before the horse; religion draws after it certain great social consequences, but it refuses to push political or economic ends. This is a lesson our modern world too must learn.

What now did Jesus bring them and us? As Whitehead insists, not a new doctrine so much as a *fresh fact embodied in his own life.* The more I contemplate that fact, the more it reminds me of a sphere. You can keep turning it round and looking at it from different sides; but still it remains the same complete and comprehensive and unified whole. On the one side it is a *new experience of God as accessible and dependable and inexhaustible love.* In our one-sided view, that is its religious aspect—to put asunder in a false dilemma what Jesus said God has forever joined together, "one and inseparable." On the other side, it is a *new attitude and spirit toward man, of the same accessible and dependable and inexhaustible love.* That is its ethical and

social aspect. But according to Jesus, these are not two things, but one and the same. In Scott's fine statement (41), all this teaching is "grounded in an ethical mysticism . . . in every act of justice and compassion we become one with God and share the divine life." In Burton's vivid phrase, there is one *single standard* of character, one quality of life, binding on both God and men; the life of service and sacrificial love. And Jesus has brought us that, not in a definition or a philosophy, but in his own way of living: spherelike, symmetrical, complete; thoroughly human, and qualitatively divine. But Jesus himself has put it better than any analysis or description of ours. "Love your enemies . . . that ye may be the children of your Father . . . be ye therefore perfect, even as He is perfect." And even more simply and irresistibly than in his words, he has given it to us in his life and death; *there in him is our clearest revelation of love, accessible and dependable and inexhaustible, for all men alike and everywhere.*

Now there is no more interesting and rewarding study in the life of Jesus than the way in which this love of his, which he said was the love of God in and through him, kept setting itself and finding itself of larger and larger orbit and circumference. He was brought up in a very particularistic and provincial thought world that claimed all the preferred stock in the Kingdom of God for the Jews. But presently he was running squarely up against orthodox Jews who were so hard and proud before men, and so calculating and complacent before God, that he saw they were shut off in outer darkness from this Kingdom of light and love. He met publicans and prodigals and harlots, who responded so quickly and completely to this love that he saw they had been received into a fellowship wider than any social class. He met a Roman centurion and a Canaanite woman whose attitudes became to him the earnest of a kingdom wider than all racial frontiers, where many from

east and west and north and south shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the universal household of God. And when he wanted to put the attitude and spirit of that kingdom into one unforgettable illustration whom did he make its embodiment? Not a Jew, complacently thanking God that he was not as other men; and not a Roman, complacently patting himself on the back because he was a go-getter who could put it over, but a Good Samaritan, whom both alike despised, but who had in his heart and practiced in his neighborliness a living faith in the love of God and man for all men alike. Wherever that attitude and spirit appeared Jesus saw God and His Kingdom.

What now has become of that spirit and attitude? I am by no means concerned to defend or maintain all of the historic Christianity. As Fosdick says, it has rolled down the centuries like a vast snowball, picking up all kinds of incongruous creeds, ceremonies, churches, civilizations, and inconsistent attitudes. But down near the heart of it there has lived and still lives something of that same spirit and faith of Jesus which has been the real core and source of its momentum. It was that spirit that moved the nameless Jews in Antioch to share the good news with their Gentile neighbors; the first use of the name Christian was there baptized into an interracial universality. It was that spirit that moved Paul to say of the churches he was founding: "Where there is neither Jew nor Greek . . . Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all, and in all." That spirit has lived near the heart of the Christian missionary enterprise ever since. Granted at once that in this far from perfect world our only partly Christianized human nature has unconsciously outworn theologies and patronizing attitudes and superiority complexes and all the rest. These things have never been the motive power of the missionary enterprise; they have been its half-assimilated and poorly packed baggage. Missionaries may carry these things with them to the ends of the earth; but these do not provide the

motive that sends them there. That motive is something of the spirit and faith they have caught from Jesus Christ.

This can be illustrated by H. T. Bailey's simple but profound parable of the lobster annually outgrowing his shell. In like manner religion painfully outgrows and leaves behind its limited thoughts of God and of His great redemptive purposes. That is the painful but indispensable process through which American religion and many of us as students are passing these days. The little girl who said that Jesus may have been a Jew but that God is a Baptist, will have a larger thought of God when she comes to know godlike people who are not Baptists—just as the universality of God has taken on new meanings for me since I came to know non-Christians like Tagore and Gandhi, whose sense of God is keener far than yours or mine. Just so science has helped us to larger thoughts of God with its conception of law and order throughout the universe—the religious parallel to which (to borrow the great phrase of a Hindu friend of mine) is the consistency of the character of God.

But when all this is said, we moderns need to remember that the life of the growing lobster is never in the outworn shell, but always in the ongoing creature; and the life of religion is never in the creeds and complexes that we leave behind, but in the outgoing spirit and upreaching faith that Jesus quickens within us. I leave you to apply that to your religious thinking and living, while I point out its bearing on the modern missionary enterprise. It is outgrowing its dogmas and superiority complexes and statistical yardsticks and sectarian programs with painful rapidity. Its life is not in these shells, however; *it is in the serving and sharing spirit of Christianity.* If that curls up beside its outgrown shell and dies, then Christianity is dead—*but not until then.* Suppose the Good Samaritan had passed by on the other side because there were so many poor victims at home in Samaria or because the Jews might resent his proffered help. Suppose Paul had done that to the Gentiles

—or had gone to India instead? What would our world have been like today?

And this all comes close home to our student generation. Dr. Niebuhr was right when he said that our predecessors drew no small part of their spiritual power from their sacrificial response to the missionary challenge. Granted that they went into it with a complacency about their civilization and their right to leadership which we can no longer share. That was, however, only the outgrown shell of their enterprise. The life within them was the quickening spirit of Jesus Christ. If we today think that in discussion group and introspective analysis alone we shall find a living faith in the God and Father of all—while we students of today pass by China's plight in complacent irresponsibility, or follow the politicians across the international highroad only when we have a debt to collect or a rubber plantation to get hold of, but never when we have a chance to help and serve in Christ's name and still more in his spirit—then indeed we may have outgrown our shells, but we shall also have lost our souls in the process. While Henry Van Dyke's language may be a bit unreconstructed, his insight is profoundly true; *the real question is not so much whether the non-Christians will be saved if we do not carry the gospel to them as it is whether* WE *shall be saved if we do not.*

But I can put this all into flesh and blood. At Oxford I encountered the wittiest man with whom I have ever crossed swords; two years ago in his Indian mission school he opened my eyes to the incongruity between American race prejudice and the Christian gospel; just before he had declined one of the chief headmasterships of England to stay with his Indian boys. Men with his spirit will never lose their faith that God is the Father of all men alike; they will live by that faith—and they will make *it* live.

VII

HOW CHRISTIANS MAKE IT DIFFICULT FOR THE WORLD TO BELIEVE IN CHRIST

TIMOTHY T. LEW

I have been asked to speak to you on the subject, "How the world has failed to believe in Christ and in his conception of God, the Father of all."

When I began to think how the world has failed to believe in Christ, pictures of events—racial, national, and personal—passed in review before my eyes, and of these the most outstanding ones have been found to be not outside the circles which bear the name of Christ himself. The world has failed to believe in Christ not so much because of the obstacles which his enemies have placed in the way, but rather due to the difficulties which the professed followers of Christ have created. Therefore, I have chosen to speak to you on "How Christians make it difficult for the world to believe in Christ."

I come today not as a critic nor as a judge, but as a student and as one who seeks for light; not as an Oriental appraising the standards of the Occident, but as a fellow Christian to share with you in a self-examination of our own common status as Christians; not as one who has achieved success in Christian life and to offer to you any new conception of Jesus or new ways of following him, but rather as one who sees the appalling failure of us who are Christians all over the world, and accepting my full share of the responsibility of the failure; as a fellow culprit standing with you before the judgment of the new Christian world, to seek forgiveness before our common Master. I shall freely draw from the experiences of China, because they are more

familiar to me, and I can even refer to them with a higher degree of assurance as to their veracity than similar examples which we can find from other parts of the world.

Unquestionably the most common way Christians have made it difficult for the world to believe in Christ is in their failure to live according to what we profess to believe in the name of Christ. To us Chinese, Christianity appears to be the most talkative religion. There are no other religious bodies which do more talking day after day than the Christian Church. Daily the Christians sing praises to Jesus. They speak of his sinlessness, of the high standards which he set for humanity, and the saving power of his grace. Missionaries as well as Chinese Christian messengers have for the last one hundred years ceaselessly tried to show differences between Jesus' conception of God and of man as against the conceptions of God and man advocated by other religious leaders. They have endeavored to bring out the sharp contrast and to show the superiority of the teaching of the Christian Church over the teaching of our own sages and moral leaders.

In the early days the Chinese people resisted the Christian message because it was new and strange to them, but the persistent work at last won a hearing, and today they take our message, not for the purpose of condemning it, but to examine it critically. Some of them are willing to take our message at its face value, but they are measuring every claim by the claim itself, and are asking whether we *do* live according to what we profess to believe.

One of the most influential leaders of thought in China today, who, with a fair-minded attitude, expresses his appreciation of what has been preached in China as the teachings of Christ, made a marvelous statement on the need of Christ by saying that "we should rejuvenate the life of the nation by injecting into the blood of the race the warm passion of Christ's love and sacrifice." But after further examination of the history of the Christian Church and the lives of some

of the Christians, he said in a later article, "The evils and the sins which have been committed by the Christian Church throughout history are literally piling up mountain high. We cannot discuss these without a sense of deep sorrow, righteous anger, and trembling fear. Christianity, judging from its record of accomplishment, has left very little which can demand our deference; it is hardly awe inspiring."

The same author went on to say that he ought to be fair to Christianity and he felt that Christianity should be examined apart from the Christian Church, that it should be judged, perhaps, separately. But one of his friends, an active and faithful servant for the social reform of China who is also a very influential leader of the new generation, insisted that apart from the Christian Church there is very little Christianity left and that Christianity should be judged by its followers' lives. The author closes his article with this pertinent remark, "I wonder how the members of the Christian Church would feel about this question."

Listen to another non-Christian, a much-admired poet of the younger generation. In the piece which is entitled, "To the Christians of Today," we find these lines:

I am not a Christian, but I am not like one of those who wears the headgear of Christ—those whose heads bear the symbols of Christ but whose lives murder him.

In this modern world is there still a Christian to be found?

To be frank, the Christians of today are no different from the politicians of today and the crowds which throng a modern stock exchange. Yes, we can see that they are not without courage, not without patience, not without persistent endeavor, but alas, all these fine qualities are for their selfish interest!

What does this modern world need such non-productive labor for? Ah, is not the heart of Jesus bleeding for the Christians of today?

It is impossible for me to translate the persuasive tone of this verse in its original form. But even in such a rough paraphrasing you can discern the moderate but persistent

tone of the message. Here is a man who has studied Christ. He has seen Christ, but he has not believed in him because of the Christians of today.

Of course, to answer such a challenge as this, we Christians inevitably resort to the stock argument, *viz:* that not all those who profess to be Christians are real Christians, and that Christianity should be judged by and understood only through the lives of those who are real Christians. But beware! When we thus try to explain our difficulty away, we immediately face a greater challenge. How about the power of Christ making them real Christians? Not long ago a Bible teacher of a woman's Bible training school eloquently showed in an article that Jesus gives us the truth and the truth makes us free, and she put her special emphasis on the fact that Jesus has the power to transform lives. A non-Christian who read that article wrote an answer in an editorial saying:

"If Jesus truly possessed that power of transforming one's life, why is it that so many Christians, and Christians of many years' standing, have still their old faults, with hardly any sign of change? These people have followed Jesus long enough and Jesus ought to have changed them by this time; the truth they claim to have, ought to have given them freedom from the sins of their lives."

Here we have a non-Christian who has failed to believe in Christ because he has put to test his claim by examining the lives of Christians and has found the test failed to substantiate it. Can we honestly say that such a test is altogether unfair? If we do, then we are one with the non-Christians in their fatal disbelief. A non-Christian college professor said in his article on the anti-Christian movement that he recognized fully the necessity of religion in human life, at least in this stage of human development. He further gave credit to every statement of lofty ideal Christian teachings about love. But he threw his whole weight of argument against this very teaching of love of

Jesus and made emphatic assertions that he disbelieved in Jesus because of the very teaching of love, because the love such as propounded by Jesus could only be talked about, but could never be lived out. He said that not only the history of Christians' lives in the past have borne out his contention, but the lives of some of the Christians of this day are worse. He said:

> As to the modern age, robbing other races of their land, destroying the nationality of other people, monopolizing their economic resources, and belittling their lives—many of the things which animals would have no heart to do—those nations do, and they profess to believe in Jesus' teachings. They even do it with keen competition among themselves, each nation trying to get ahead of the other! I really do not see where the love of Christ is.

Oh! how can the world believe in Christ when in their attempt to see him and to believe in him they find us who are Christians, as individuals or as nations, standing in their way?

The second great difficulty which we as Christians have placed in the way of those who want to believe in Christ is our superficiality and our half-heartedness, *not whether we do it, but whether we have done enough.*

Out in China we have seen in the last hundred years consecrated missionaries from these western lands carry on work of mercy and service of helpfulness. They have established hospitals, dispensaries for healing the sick; they have introduced modern systems of education to enlighten the uneducated; they have through their written and spoken words helped to overcome the superstitions of the daily life of the masses; they have ministered to various classes of human sufferers and enabled the blind to see and the lame to walk, the deaf and dumb to read and talk, even the lepers and other kinds of loathesomely diseased have been ministered to. They have fed the hungry in the famine days, and they have clothed some helpless orphans in their shivering cold. They inaugurated some of the movements toward the libera-

tion of fettered womanhood. They have helped in the terrible struggle against the shackles of the opium evil.

These and many other forms of service are living examples and expositions of Jesus' conception of God as Father of all. The Chinese Christian workers today, 24,000 of them, work with these missionaries in their daily toil of their Father's business.

It would be a gross injustice to the non-Christian Chinese public to say that they do not see these evidences of Christ's teachings before their eyes. Numbers have been added to the Christian church everywhere in China wherever Jesus' teachings have been persistently producing these fruits. Thousands have been led to see Christ because of it. But we are now facing a new generation of college men and women who possess a burning sense of the need of a new order. They are asking for a thorough reformation, an entire rebuilding of the existing structure. They are not satisfied with a Jesus whose highest achievement is *mere patchwork*. They want a Saviour who can really bring about a thoroughgoing transformation of the nation. They are not blind to what great or little services we as Christians try to render to the people in the name of Jesus. They give credit to what we do, but they insist that what we do is not enough. They have watched as far as we have gone, and they insist that we shall go farther—go the full length of the teachings of Jesus in whom we profess to believe.

Listen to this poem which is widely known in China among the younger generation. It was written by an important leader in politics and education. The piece is entitled "Amen."

> The pastor said, "The pleasures of the flesh
> Have little to do with the spiritual life of a man.
> Go ahead and do your work,
> Continually being patient:
> All the difficulties that come from suffering
> Are decreed by the Almighty God,

Thou shalt raise no finger of protest,
It is thy duty to obey.
Wait until thy dying hour comes,
Then will come the angel
To welcome thee to the heavenly abode, Amen."

Leaving the gate of the church,
Enter into the workshop,
Work hard for twelve hours,
Earn twenty cents in small money,
Exchange for a measure of rough rice.
This is the gift of God
For which I should offer my gratitude.
God! Oh God!
Such bountiful grace from Thee!
How can I repay back to Thee?
I only hope Thou wilt allow me
To enter Thy kingdom to wait on Thee.
Amen.

One month, two months, three months;
One year, two years, three years;
Eat, yet suffer hunger,
Sleep, yet with fatigue,
Hands and feet attacked by disease,
Wet and benumbed,
The passages of the lungs are filled with microbes.
Where has gone that strong, stout, healthy muscle?
All that is left—a few skinny bones.
God! Oh God!
How dare I disobey Thy decree?
But look, I am full of disease.
Amen.

One day without work, rice is gone.
Two days without work, clothes are gone.
And then, that merciless landlord comes
To drive me out into the streets.
Such a luxurious Shanghai!
I can only see many serene and beautifully built churches of God.
But I fail to find a poor, even broken, house of refuge.

God! Oh God!
Speed Thy coming and take me
Into Thy heavenly kingdom to wait on Thee.
Amen.

Such an expression from this new generation is not merely a thoughtless, unkind arraignment against Christianity to vent any ill feelings, but rather a passionate cry for greater consistencies and thoroughness in our Christian life.

Nowhere is this point more clearly shown than where occasional examples of thoroughgoing Christian life have been seen. One of the recent converts of Christianity in China, an educator of fifteen years' standing, who has engaged in the work of educating thousands of youth, in the testimony he made of his conversion before a fellowship of Christian believers gathered together to discuss the future of Christian movement in China, said that there were two things which helped him to decide to become a Christian. The first one was the visit he made to Cornell University when he visited America. There he met a Christian whose love for China and for the Chinese people appeared to him to be perfectly genuine, a woman whose husband and son were missionaries in China and died in 1900 as martyrs, but she said in spite of all this she still loved the Chinese and wanted to do all that she could for China, and for all that he knew she had been doing all that she could to help China. It is this thoroughgoing love that moved him and helped him actually to believe in Jesus.

To those whose passion is to find a way of salvation to China in her present-day difficulties, they are looking for evidences of thoroughgoing application of Christianity and upon this rock they shall build their faith in Jesus, *not only whether we do it, but how much we do.*

The third great difficulty which we as Christians have placed in the way of those who want to believe in Christ is our wrong attitude in right doings. The world believes in Christ not only according to what we do with the teachings

of Christ, not only according to how much we do with the teachings of Christ, but also in a great measure according to what manner we carry out the teachings of Christ. *Not only whether we do it and do it enough, but also how we do it.*

To us Chinese, relationship is fundamental in all our thinking. Our traditional standards and our spiritual and religious life were expressed in terms of human relationship. Christianity fails or succeeds according to its ability to meet the needs of the Chinese people in their effort to promote better relationship and to recognize their relationship. To us Chinese Christians the teachings of Jesus have been a valuable asset because they help us to invigorate the life of our human relationship in terms of the relationship with the Divine. The history of Christianity in China is one which deserves much careful study from the point of view of important relationship. China has faced many difficulties in making herself understood because some of the teachings of Jesus as recorded in our Gospels have appeared to come into conflict with the human relationship according to our traditional standards. But the greatest of all difficulties along this line is not so much the abstract teachings, as such, but rather the actual living out of the relationship by the Christians in their daily life with the non-Christians.

With the tremendous amount of unselfish service rendered to persons individually or to persons in a group —and much of this service is extremely valuable and timely—there should have been better understanding of the teachings of the Master in whose name these services were rendered, and they ought to have led more people than they have to believe in Him. Yet, we can easily find that this has not been so; not at least as much as one really has the right to expect.

If we are willing to watch closely, we will find that *the wrong attitude* has been responsible for it. One of the most

common wrong attitudes is the attitude for superiority on the part of those who try to serve. Does Jesus' conception of God as the Father of all allow one to assume any attitude of superiority toward any other person? To me fraternity and equality are two inseparable elements. There is really no genuine fraternity unless there is a sincere recognition of equality of personalities.

The attitude of self-superiority hurts the person who comes into contact with it. Silently it demands the reaction of the feeling of inferiority. It is an assault of one personality upon another. The repetition of such an assault produces an inferiority complex which, in turn, extinguishes the hope of growth of spiritual development. It calls forth not appreciation and gratitude but their very opposites, ingratitude and resentment. Sometimes such resentment destroys the valuable contact at its outset and spiritual relationship between any two such persons dies before it is born. Sometimes the resentment is concealed when the recipient of the service finds his need of such service greater than his power of resistance. Thus he endures it reluctantly instead of joyfully accepting the service. Resentment under these circumstances, because it is hidden, is often more violent. The very indispensability of the service suggests the helplessness and that very feeling of helplessness embitters the relationship. That is why we often find people who seemingly have received so much and from whom much may be expected, yet they are farther away in the right relationship with Jesus and with his disciples than we realize. How many souls not only in China, but all over the world, are not being led to believe in Christ and in his conception of God as the Father of all, but rather being led away from this belief through well-intentioned words said, even truly devoted service of Christ rendered with wrong attitude—the attitude of self-superiority.

Such a wrong attitude not only hurts the person to whom this attitude is shown, but it also hurts the person who shows

it. It gives one a certain amount of sense of well being. He feels that he is the stronger and that he is given the responsibility of bearing the burdens of others who he thinks are inferior to him.

That a sense of responsibility is essential to one's devotion and persistence in service is not to be questioned. Almost all great world movements were born and carried into successful accomplishment by those who possessed this very sense of responsibility and the conviction that they were the very ones sent by God to bear it. But when such sense of responsibility is divorced from the sense of genuine Christ-like humility, then it becomes the most dangerous thing a man may possess.

We who are out in the East often hear that oft-repeated expression "the white man's burden." Looking around the whole world at its sore needs and looking at the West with its superior advantages in natural and spiritual resources, there is genuinely a white man's burden; the burden of Christ-like service. And yet, how often this opportunity and this conception has been destroyed, twisted in the hands of the knaves to inflame the passion of world domination, using it as an excuse of out-and-out non-Christian imperialism. The world is spiritually bleeding today because of the imperialism of the Christian nations.

The sense of superiority produces a sense of self-satisfaction. It inevitably degenerates itself into self-complacency; and how self-complacency has done ravage in the spiritual realm! It keeps us from seeing new visions. It binds us down to the rut of our unchristian habits. We Christians often wonder why, after 2,000 years of Christian preaching and the tremendous amount of Christian service rendered, and with so many lives of consecrated men and women offered, there has been so little appreciation, gratitude, and response from the non-Christian world. If we would only look within and without and watch the behavior of Christian men and women while they are rendering their service

and look at such behavior in the light of divine humility of the Master!

The wrong attitude of Christians is not only confined to the gross form of condescension. It is also manifested in a more subtle way of failing to see the good in others. When one fails to see the good qualities in another person's spiritual life, he can never come into intimate fellowship with him spiritually. He cannot, therefore, serve him in any profitable way. When one fails to see the genuine contributions in the religion of another, he cannot help him to see the weaknesses in it. A Christian cannot help a non-Christian of another faith to believe in Jesus and see the grandeur and the uniqueness in him when he fails to approach a non-Christian with a Christ-like simplicity and humility in the beautiful way in which Christ himself did in preaching to the sinners and publicans of his day. We can only properly exercise the function of criticism when we can ably exercise the function of appreciation. How many non-Christians we have turned away from the very gate of the temple within the hearing distance of the Master himself by the improper attitude of us who are trying to lead them to him!

The fourth great difficulty which we as Christians have placed in the way of those who want to believe in Christ, is our failure to keep our motive persistently pure, not only how we do it, but *why* we do it.

Out in China, the Christian movement was at the very outset faced with the challenge of motive. That the Christian missionary movement was animated by a lofty and pure motive of serving the world and leading the world to Christ, is an unquestionable fact of history. It could not have lived, grown, and prospered under the divine sanction and heavenly benediction if it were not so; and for this very reason we Christians have the responsibility to make it clear and to keep it unmistakably clear before the eyes of the non-Christian world that our motive is beyond question.

There are just enough experiences of China in her relation with the nations of the West within the last one hundred years to becloud this vital issue. For example, how can a loyal Chinese citizen ever forget that China once lost practically all of her most important and valuable harbors to four different Christian powers because of the death of two missionaries? Of course, this is becoming past history, but we cannot help but come back again and again and look at this phase of history of the relation of Christian nations to China. Because, while it is an incident of past history, it was the seed planted in the hearts of the people which is now bearing bitter fruits. The awakening masses of China are now developing a national consciousness under the pressure of troubles within and pressures without. This national consciousness brings them again and again to face the facts of past history, reminding them of the blunders of the past and leading them to explain the causes of the sufferings of today in terms of these past experiences.

The new nationalistic movement in China is also tearing the mask of economic aggression from the face of international friendship. It is painfully looking at it in its grim reality. Hundreds of thousands of organized labor and millions of children in school are being taught that the motives of the Christian movement in China are not to be separated from the motives of the political and economic exploiters of the same nations from whence missionaries are sent.

A severe test is put when the economic and political exploiters come into clash with the life of the Chinese, and the latter watch to see which side the heralds of messages of love and peace will take. Would they be willing to stand with the Chinese people in their aspirations and hopes for their free and untrammeled development? Would the Christians in the West stand firm with the Chinese in such struggles and efforts, or with the political and economic exploiters of their own nation? Not only China, but other

nations all over the world are standing with China and watching the West with eager eyes and nervously clinched fists.

Not only the motives of Western Christians are under examination. The motives of Chinese Christians are under no less rigid scrutiny by the non-Christians of today. You will find in almost every kind of literature published by the propagandists of anti-Christianity and anti-religious movements, keen and shrewd analysis of the various kinds of motives or the mixture of different motives of the various individuals in the Chinese Christian church. A catalogue of these would not be short, and it is also painfully humiliating to us Chinese Christians to read it, if all the alleged motives were true. There is going on a serious searching of hearts among Chinese Christians. We ought to know just why we have become Christians and just why we try to do the teachings of Jesus. Some friends in the West are afraid of the anti-Christian propaganda of Russia in China and they express their worry over the safety and peace of Christians. They fear that such propaganda, if there is any, will result in persecution.

Some of us somehow feel that if such a persecution should come, it would not, after all, be a bad thing. Before the year 1900, many Chinese Christians were accused of being mere rice Christians, but when 1900 came, non-Christians witnessed thousands of Christians, men and women, old and young, die for the faith. They did not cease to be loyal to their Master when not only was there no rice to get, but also life to lose. The odium of rice Christians was to a great extent washed clean by the very blood of the martyrs. There may be the need of another purification, another test to see how much dross is now in the great alloy of the Christian community in China. Such tests are not only needed in China, they are needed in the West and in all parts of the world where there are Christians who are endeavoring to teach the non-Christians the ways of Christ. The

world needs to be convinced *why* we believe in Jesus before it will be willing to believe in him.

I shall mention only one more of those outstanding difficulties which we as Christians have placed in the way of those who want to believe in Christ, and that is *the failure to carry out the principle of love and unity among us Christians ourselves.*

Before we can win the peoples of the world by teaching them the love of Christ, we must set an example to them how we love one another within the Christian fold. To me the significance of the brief sojourn of the Master on this earth was to teach us, among many other things, the supreme value and necessity of fellowship. The three short years were years of experimentation of the great mission of reconciliation between the human and the Divine through concrete practice of fellowship. The five thousand, the five hundred, the seventy, the twelve, and the three. If we had detailed records of everything that happened in those three years, we would find perhaps no week nor day when the Master's attention and effort were shifted from that of fellowship to any extreme individualistic emphasis which loses the significance of group and of a social whole.

Christ's prayer for his disciples was not for their individual success or individual achievement, but for unity of and love of the group. Love and unity were indeed the two cornerstones of the Christian Church. The Church grew out of fellowship. It was carried on by love. Love and fellowship were the invincible powers of the Christian community against sword, fire, and dungeon. It survives persecution and oppression; it expands and grows until it reaches all corners of the earth, because it carries with it the sense of unity in the all-embracing love of its founder and head.

The most powerful backing the early Christian Church had was not gunboats and financial reserve, but that unity and mutual love and helpfulness which even touched its

enemies and compelled them to say with envy and admiration, "See how these Christians love one another."

In fact, it was the only condition which the Church could survive at all. But alas! when the Church became powerful, when the Church was firmly established as an institution, with worldly prestige and power, corruption and other weaknesses led to its disruption. The history of the Christian Church instead of being a noble example of harmony, love, and unity becomes a shameful example of schisms, divisions, and unchristian controversies.

We who are in China look at the enormous divisions within the Christian Church with mingled emotions and different reactions. Some of us are dazed at the innumerable divisions into which the Christian Church has been officially broken and are astonished to see how intense is the unforgiving spirit and lack of Christian tolerance concerning some of the Western civilization over certain religious issues.

Others have been trained with painstaking care to appreciate the differences and even to learn to champion them. But in our quieter and thoughtful moments, we see that in doing so we are yielding to the human rather than the divine urge. We respect convictions. For convictions a Christian should live and die. But is there not something sometimes greater and higher than the conviction of the human finite mind? Without conviction strong love becomes the reef of destruction rather than the rock of safety. The place of love cannot be replaced by anything else, and it must not be usurped by anything else in Jesus' scheme of relationship founded on his conception of God as the Father of all. We must recognize the value of individual differences endowed in human beings by God. We must respect this as the gift of God to enrich our lives and not for the purpose of producing antagonisms and perpetuating strife.

The non-Christian world today has an equal access to the facts of the history of the Christian Church, for the last 2,000 years, as we have ourselves. It sees for itself how

we Christians have treated one another, and by far this is the strongest weapon it has by which to attack the very citadel of our endeavor. We Chinese Christians after one hundred years of tutelage under missionaries, some of us, have taken for granted that these conflicts and divisions have to remain. Because we believe Christians are human, we will have the same temptations. It is quite conceivable that we too will succumb to provincialism, group prejudices, and organized preferences and will follow the line of least resistance.

If all Western denomination is taken out of China, there may arise a Chinese denominationalism, no better and no worse than that which is now in the West.

But for all that, those who have eyes to see the tremendous needs of Christ in China can never fail to realize what a united Church, a truly Church-centered fellowship, dominated by Christ-like love, would mean to China. Theological differences, factional interests, and personal preferences —how big they loom before our eyes when we forget about Jesus and his teachings about God as the Father of all. But how small and insignificant these differences dwindle in the blazing sun of God's love such as taught by Jesus, and how ridiculous these differences appear to be in the face of the tremendous task we have to accomplish. He who will not love his brother, whom he has seen, can he love God whom he has never seen?

How can the world believe in Jesus and in his teachings about God as the Father of all? The world will only know him when we Christians remove the difficulties which we have created in our own shortcomings. We must live according to what we profess to believe; we must not only follow the teachings of Jesus, but follow them to the full length; we must truly imitate Christ in his attitude, and we must purify our motive by his divine fire. And in all the practical applications of his teachings we must begin with ourselves.

As I stand before you today I see how urgently China and the whole world need Christianity. The millions of Chinese need a teacher who will show them an adequate philosophy of life. They are ready to follow. Hundreds and thousands of men and women who are searching for the solution to our national and social problems are looking for a guide that will point to them the right direction where solution is to be found. They are ready to follow. There are countless individuals in their daily struggle for a better spiritual and moral life, facing just the kind of problems which you are facing here; they are looking for a personal friend, a friend who will teach them with sympathy and love, who will be able to share with them individually the most intimate spiritual experiences. They are ready to follow. Millions are now in the throes of sufferings, sufferings from evils of all kind—military, political, national, international, economic, and social. They are looking for a deliverer who will save them from all these sufferings and give them a hope of a new future. They are ready to follow, by the grace of God, when the promised future shall come. And then the whole nation will need a Saviour to save them from the success and prosperity as much as from the suffering and the sins and the disappointments today. China cries out for a Saviour, and the world is waiting in patience with a passionate longing.

It is said that Christ has come. You and your forefathers have worshiped him for centuries. Have you found him yourselves? Do you understand him? Do you know him and feel with him? Young men and women of America, discover him if you have not yet found him. In these days of national fellowship, may Christ come and walk among us in these conferences. May we recognize him and sit at his feet. May we leave this Conference with him and go forth with a new vision and, what is more important, with a new power which will remove the obstacles and help to bring not only China but the whole world to Christ's feet.

VIII

THE MEANING OF GOD'S UNIVERSAL FATHERHOOD IN THE RELATIONS OF THE RACES

MORDECAI JOHNSON

Fellow Students: Even at the last moment before I speak to you (and I am happy to be able to speak to you), I am torn between two desires. On the one hand, I desire to speak to you about the leading of the Universal Father in the realm of personal race relations. On the other hand, I desire to indicate to you the objective social implications of the Father's will in the world race situation that we now face. I would really prefer to do the first, because the first would allow me to indicate to you some of those fine personalities whom I have come to know in this world and some of the experiences of man which have strengthened my faith and shown me the beauty of the face of the Lord. But I am constrained to believe that we are now in a crisis with regard to the race question in the world, and while I would prefer to do the other, I am moved by necessity to speak to you about the social implications of the Fatherhood of God in the realm of race relations.

The problem of race antagonism is a world problem. There was a time when we thought that it was a problem peculiar to us in America and that it was very largely a sectional question. Since the Civil War, when great numbers of Negroes have come to the North and East and West, we now know that it is no longer a sectional question in America, because all of the forms of antagonism which have manifested themselves in the southern states have manifested themselves in the North and the East and the West.

And since the World War, we have been hearing the clash of wills and the cry of pain in race relationships all over the world. The same clash of antagonisms and the same cry of hurt that we hear in America from the Negro in his relationships to white people, we hear in India, we hear in China, we hear in Africa, we hear wherever the representatives of the Western powers have come in contact with the darker and economically more backward peoples. We now know, therefore, that the problem of race antagonism is a world problem. Whoever does anything about it is working on a problem of world-wide significance, and if he makes any contribution to it at all, he is making a contribution to the growth and peace of the world.

We now know, also, that race antagonism is a moral problem. There was a time when we thought that it might be biological. The anthropologists have been studying it for years. While they have discovered some differences between human beings of different colors and races, they have discovered that the fundamental likenesses between human beings of all colors are so great and so preponderant that there can be no theoretical ground on which any group of people can justify themselves in exploiting and otherwise injuring another group.

We know it is a moral problem also, because if the anthropologists had not placed it on this basis, we could see, from the individual accomplishments of distinguished Chinese, Japanese, Indians, and Negroes, the great creative possibilities that lie in the darker peoples of the world. No measurement of the heel, no theoretic study of varied intelligence tests can ever deprive these peoples of the conviction that they have within themselves great creative powers yet undeveloped which are being smothered in them by the things that they suffer in the world today.

We know it is a moral problem also because we know the history of modern racial antagonism. In the Middle Ages no such antagonism existed between black men and white

men, brown men and white men, and yellow men and white men as exists in the world today. The whole thing is an outgrowth of the colonizing and imperialistic spirit of the European nations, beginning with the seventeenth century. It began in economic exploitation. The European nationalities released from the bond of unity by the Protestant Reformation, launched out in a great competition amongst themselves for world power and world domination. They entered the fields of the darker peoples of the earth, first of all in their own economic interests; they exploited the land and the labor of the people in a small way before the industrial revolution. But when the industrial revolution came, they began to exploit the labor and the land of the people with enormous rapidity.

No sooner did they begin to exploit the land and the labor of the people than they began to feel the antagonism of the people, and then in the interest of economic exploitation, they began to interfere with the government of the people, first of all to influence the government, and then to take the government entirely away from the people and to handle it very largely in the interest of economic exploitation.

Then, after they had settled on a long career of economic and political exploitation and domination, they stamped upon the darker peoples wherever they touched them the stigma of inferiority. This stigma of inferiority is the left-handed compliment which economic and political imperialism has paid to the Christian religion. It has offered this argument to excuse itself in the doing of deeds against which the Christian conscience would be forever in revulsion.

We know, therefore, that the problem of world-wide race antagonism is a moral problem. We now know also what the darker peoples want. It is no longer necessary for anyone to speak for another race and to say that he represents their desires. They have all come now to the place where they speak for themselves. Their cry is unanimous

all over the world, whether it be from black Louisiana or brown India or yellow China or darkest Africa. "We want," they say, "freedom from economic exploitation; we want to participate in whatever economic system touches us on the basis of our merit as individuals; we want freedom from political domination; we want our real interests represented in whatever government rules; we want an education, not an education that will fit us for a certain subordinate status, but an education that will fit us to make a living in the world as it is, and to understand the kind of creative life that can be lived in the world as it is; we want the stigma of inferiority to be lifted from us; we want to be able to walk down the streets of the world and into the common gathering places of mankind free from contempt; and we want to enter into self-respecting companionship and friendship with all men of all races who find with us a common bond of fellowship."

There are Christian statesmen in the world who listen to these cries and who say, "These are the legitimate aspirations of striving human beings. These are the voices of the striving of the spirit of the living God in His Sons, longing for freedom, longing for self-expression, longing for self-respect, longing for fundamental fellowship with all human kind."

"They ought to have unfettered opportunity for the realization of these hopes," say men like Sir Frederick Luggard. Economic and political exploitation of these peoples cannot stand in the face of the Christian spirit. These conditions ought to be removed from the Indian, the African, the Chinese, the Negro, and from every human being that cries with hurt because of them. It is the glory of European and American nations to give these peoples the opportunity which they seek and to give it to them quickly while it can yet be given.

But we may as well understand, if we get a proper view of the world as it is, that Christian statesmen are in the

minority. They by no means control the political or the economic policy of any of the European powers. They do not control the economic and political outreach of the United States.

Over against the Christian statesman who would give political and economic liberty and set up conditions productive of thoroughgoing self-respect, there are those who place their feet on the status quo as that which should be and must be final. Hear one of their spokesmen when he says, "The black peoples of Africa, the brown peoples of India, the black peoples of America, the yellow peoples of China are where they are because they ought to be there. Europeans and Americans exploit them because they have the power to do so and ought to do so. We ought to keep them where they are. We ought to keep them where they are in peace, if we can, but we will keep them where they are by the utmost use of force, if we need to."

These two stand over one against the other: Christian aspiration and economic and political imperialism backed up by militaristic determination.

There was a time when these were the only two contenders in the field, but today this is no longer true. Everywhere there is arising an acute race and national consciousness, and there is another spokesman, international communism, which says to the rising young nationalists in China, for example, "Listen to me. Don't pay any attention to these Christian missionaries. They have no program. When you probe down to the very foundations of their program, it is one with the program of imperialism. They would not lift a hand to keep economic and political imperialism from dominating your land. And even if they do have a program, they have neither the intelligence nor the power to make it a reality. The only choice that you have is between economic and political imperialism and revolutionary nationalism. Shut your eyes and ears to religion and build up a strong national, racial consciousness and overturn the

power of economic and political imperialism by the force of your own resistance."

Well, is this so? Is there a Christian program for China? Is there a Christian program for Africa? Is there a Christian program for India? If there is, the time has come for that program to be laid on the table in the open to be explained without equivocation, and to be fought for with every weapon consistent with the spirit of Jesus. For the only possible alternative between radical economic and political imperialism and radical racial nationalism is a radical, fearless Christianity which announces its position and fights for it with all of its might.

Christianity has a program. It is a radical program. It is a program which grows out of its great doctrine of the Fatherhood of God. When it is announced, as it should be announced, it says to the economic imperialists, "Lift off your hand there. Be careful how you feed human souls into the mill of money making, for every living creature is sacred to the living God." It says to the political imperialists, "Be careful there how you crush men's wills in a government to which they do not give their consent, for God's own aspirations swell in the bosoms of the people, and people who want self-determination and self-expression in government want what God wants them to have."

Christianity has never lacked representatives of that program. On every interracial front in the world Christianity has such representatives. In China she has them; in India she has them; in Africa she has them. And when I was a black boy in the south, coming out from the home of slaves, I met them there. Existing in the form of Anglo-Saxons, they thought it not a thing to be grasped after to be on equality with Anglo-Saxons, but humbled themselves and took upon themselves the form of servants and made themselves obedient unto the needs of slaves, in order that through their personal contact we, the children of slaves, might know the truth and the truth might set us free. On

every front of the world, Christianity has had such representatives. They have given to the world the finest explanation of the Christian doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, for they have shown that great power means great service and that whosoever would be great in this world must bow himself to serve the humblest.

I glory in those representatives of the Christian religion on every far-flung field. In them God has lighted a candle that will shine unto the ends of the ages. They are the frontiersmen of the world-wide Kingdom of God.

But, my friends, our enthusiasm about the beauty and glory of missionaries must not blind us to the essential weakness of what they have done; for the quantity of what they have done is so small in comparison with the quantity of harm that has been done by economic exploitation and political domination, and the pace at which they have gone forward is so slow as compared with the awful pace of destructive economic exploitation and political domination, that the total effect of the western white world upon the darker peoples of the earth has been and continues to be in the large an antagonism-producing effect. What we are witnessing in the world today is the bitter fruit of antagonism producing economic and political exploitation that could not be checked by the fine example of noble, individual missionaries.

Why has this total effect of the missionaries been so small as compared with these other effects? Here is the critical point, my friends. Because they have not received the proper support at the home base. We at the home base have been content with supporting the missionaries with our extra change; we have been content to hold the ropes while they did the suffering, while they did the heroic things, while they walked with the Father in distant countries and in slave lands and bore the Cross. We should have been at work, all along, trying to capture the entire national will for the thing that they were trying to do.

One result of this state of affairs is that Christianity for the last fifty years has been feeding very largely on the enthusiasm and faith and religious experience of missionaries, while we at home have been raising missionary collections, carrying on our denominational activities, building churches, counting our statistics, and keeping our faith alive with continuous hypodermics of apologetics. We need so much apologetics today because we are trying to convince ourselves intellectually that the Fatherhood of God is a reality when we have dared nothing for which we have depended upon God to give us the resources of His Fatherhood. The missionary has dared everything, and he stands in no need of mere apologetics. We have given him a collection, and we stand in need of the assurance that the Father exists at all.

From this day onward, every thoughtful Christian man knows that while we must continue those great missionaries on the field and increase their numbers, the major effort of the Christian Church in this generation must be the effort to capture the national will of our several countries. We must capture the economic outgo; we must capture the very motive of economic enterprise; we must capture the political vision and the political activity in its entirety, if we are to realize the great hope of Christ that this real, literal world should be a world in which the Father's will becomes a reality.

In America the possibility of capturing the national will is a great and romantic undertaking. It is still possible. It may look foolhardy to dream that it is possible, but it is possible. We have here a young country just emerging into the very first rank of the world economic and political powers. In that country at its very heart we have the world's problem of race antagonism in crucible, in experimental edition. Half of the population of the United States is professedly Christian. If that half of the population were determined in this generation to settle the race problem

within America and to capture the will of America for a strong, constructive Christian interracial policy in the world, it could do it. And it is the program for doing this that I now want to give you.

It involves four points. First it involves a deliberate and thoroughgoing attempt to emancipate and enlist the Negro in the Christian cause. The first thing in that program would be that Christians should relieve the Negro from the stigma of inferiority. There are 40,000,000 Christians in the United States. If those Christians wanted to do so, by the end of the year 1927 they could lift the stigma of inferiority entirely from the Negro's face. But the awful fact is, my friends, that the Negro must bear the stigma of inferiority in America, not alone from those who do not believe in Christ, but continually and daily he must suffer personal and group insult from the professed followers of Jesus Christ.

And do you know why the followers of Jesus do that? They have not estimated what the Negro is. The Negro is no object of charity to have somebody give him a pitying helpfulness. The Negro constitutes 12,000,000 people, one tenth of the population of the United States. That 12,000,000 of people are candidates to be soldiers in somebody's army. Are they going to be soldiers in the army of discontent, struggling with every power that they can lay their hands on to secure economic and political privilege for themselves? Are they going to be soldiers in the army of economic and political imperialism, fighting to subdue the world to the United States of America? Or are they going to be soldiers of Christ in the Christian army? If they are going to be soldiers of Christ in the Christian army, the Christian Church cannot condescend to them, it cannot patronize them, it cannot shove them off in the distance. The Christian Church must consider that they are men and women possessed of great vital possibilities, great capacities for soldiers, and they must salute them as possible com-

rades in the great cause of winning the national will for Christ.

If we do so consider them, we will hasten the progress of education which has been going on so slowly for Negroes, and we will have no doubt about the kind of education that Negroes ought to have; we will give them education so that they can earn their living, to be sure, but we will most of all want to give them that kind of education which acquaints them with the objectives of the Christian spirit, and with every resource and method by which they can gain those objectives in such a world as this.

We will admit them to industry in a way that Christians are not admitting them to industry today. We will admit them to industry and permit them to advance as individuals according to their individual capacity. Christians themselves control enough industry in this country to settle the economic side of the race problem in twenty-five years, if they would only act radically upon the principle of the Fatherhood of God. Give Negroes no sops, no hand-outs; let them come into industry on the ground floor; let no man rise except the man who is able, but if a man has ability, even though he be as black as midnight, let him rise according to his ability. For if he has ability to rise in industry, he has capacity also to invest the earnings of industry in the great advancement of the kingdom of God.

In the last place, in that part of the program, we will hasten the day when the Negro's real interests will be represented in the government. White statesmen will arise in Mississippi and in all States to represent the real interests of the Negro, and there will be a hastening of the day when the Negro will be permitted to represent his own interests in the public life, in order that he may exercise through the ballot every ounce of constructive influence that he can bring to bear upon the nation's policy in the realm of race relations.

It is only when we look upon the Negro as a candidate

for the Christian army that we have a point of view of the situation high enough and wide enough to understand what we must do for him and with him in the realm of economics, education, and politics.

The second element of the program is our relationship to the darker peoples of the central and the South American Republics, of the Chinese and Japanese nations, and of the Islands of the Pacific. This country has no reason to enter upon an economic imperialism such as characterized Great Britain, France, and Germany in the latter part of the nineteenth and in the early part of this century. We have sufficient national resources to sustain ourselves for unlimited years, and already we stand in the front rank of the powers of the world.

If the 40,000,000 Christians of the United States were determined to affect the national will in the Christian way, inside of the next twenty-five years we could exhibit a relationship to Nicaragua, Haiti, Mexico, the Philippine Islands, the Chinese government, and the people of Japan so far superior to every example of economic and political imperialism in the world that the affection of the darker peoples of the earth would run out to us in great gladness. They would have joy in discovering that there was a strong and self-controlled nation like us in the world. It is worth while so to affect the national will, but unless we set ourselves deliberately to do so, our nation will become an economic and political imperialism before the Christian Church awakes to the fact that the danger is in existence.

The third element of my program would be cooperation with the nations of the world in maintaining at their real worth the mandates of the League of Nations, and a constructive and big-brother attitude toward the people of Africa and India. There are people in Great Britain, France, Germany and other nations who desire that a real constructive Christian policy shall prevail in Africa and India. There are people in Great Britain, in Germany, in

France, and in other nations who do not want that policy to prevail, and who will do everything in their power to destroy the intended effect of the mandates and to continue economic and political imperialism in Africa and India.

But if the United States, controlled by Christian conscience, enters into the councils of the nations and lifts her voice to support the interests of those statesmen who really want a new policy in Africa and India, that new policy can be had; but if we ourselves play a lone hand, we will drift into economic and political imperialism in the Western world, and there will ensue a great and death-dealing contest between us and Britain, France, Germany, and other powers which Christian efforts in the succeeding years will in no wise avail to stop until its full course of destruction is run.

The last element in my program is a program of nonviolent non-cooperation with the imperialistic elements of our national life in our own country. The Roman Catholic Church has always had the doctrine that the church was superior to the state, that the state was no end in itself, and that in a last and critical situation, therefore, the church could absolve the allegiance of its members from the state.

The Protestant churches will never exercise in this world the power for Christ that they can exercise until they plant their feet on that doctrine, courageously interpret it, and stand by it with every ounce of energy that they have within themselves. Those elements of the American population which intend, in spite of every Christian aspiration, to turn this nation into an economic and political imperialism backed up by military power should be made to know that there is in America a large and considerable body of individual citizens who, because of their sworn allegiance to the Fatherhood of God as revealed in Christ Jesus, will not fight in an imperialistic war.

Well, that is all of my program. But some of you will say, "Are you not foolish to think that Christians, split into

two hundred denominations, could carry out such a program?" Oh yes, I would be a fool to speak about it, if Jesus had not spoken about it before me. In his day the world was dominated by the mailed fist of the Roman Empire. He looked at it calmly and said to his disciples, "They that are accustomed to rule over Gentiles lord it over them, but it shall not be so among you. But whosoever would be great among you, let him be your servant. Whosoever should be greatest among you, let him be your slave," and his disciple interpreted him rightly when he said, "Love not this world nor the things that are in this world, for this world passeth away." We have been interpreting him to mean that this mortal life passes into immortality, but I tell you Jesus meant that this real, literal world, based upon domination and force and exploitation, shall pass away, and in its stead there will come another world, dominated by the Spirit of God, in which all men will be free, all men will be brotherly, and a great gladness will circulate from heart to heart.

To those simple men who believed, sitting down on the mountainside, he said, with calm, cool eyes, "Ye are the light of the world." I think I can see Peter now, looking at his old, hard hands and saying, "Do you mean it? Are not the Roman senators at this moment discussing foreign policy and how they can continue control of the world? And is not Cæsar ruling?"

Yes, Cæsar is on the throne, the Roman senators are in their councils discussing the future domination of the world. But I tell you the future of the world does not lie with Cæsar nor with the Roman senators, but with those pure hearts who love mankind and who are willing to risk all in a great adventure to change the world on the basis of love.

I set forth this program because it is the program of Jesus and because we have at our disposal the resources of the Infinite God. The two hundred different denomina-

tions of the Protestant Church will never argue themselves together. There is no chair of apologetics in the world that will ever bring together two hundred different denominations. There is only one thing that will bring us together—a program so big that we cannot do it by ourselves, a program which needs all our combined strength and the help of the Invisible God to get it done. Then we will get together. And the program I have set before you is such a program.

But you say to me in parting, "Young man, whoever tries that program will suffer." Oh yes, oh yes; I have looked at that. Don't let anybody deceive you into thinking that what Jesus wants is your spare time, your spending change, your cigar money. Don't deceive yourselves. He asks for your life, and the young men and young women of this generation have two choices as to how they will spend their lives. You may spend your lives as cannon fodder to support an imperialistic program in the world, or you may spend them behind the Cross of Jesus fighting imperialism on the home ground in behalf of the brotherhood of man. In either case you have to risk your life. I call upon you to risk it for the program of Jesus. Every single missionary has risked it. Those white men and women who came down South after the Civil War suffered all things—loneliness, hunger and distress of spirit, ostracism, calumny; and those young white men and young white women in the South who have looked on the face of Jesus and who have launched themselves on this program (blessed be God, the South is no longer solid) are paying the price, too, of loneliness, criticism, threatened loss of jobs, ostracism, humiliation of every kind.

Of all these and of Jesus, their contemporaries have said, "They are foolish, they are smitten of God, smitten because of their nonsensical ideas"; but Paul says that Jesus died on the Cross because of the joy that was set before him; and when we look thoughtfully at the cross of Jesus, on the

sufferings of the missionaries, and on the suffering of all men who have been bruised in the struggle for a brotherly world, we know that they are bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace is upon them, and by their stripes we are all being healed. The Cross is the power of God and the wisdom of God. Jesus said, "If any man would be my disciple, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me."

IX

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND THE RELIGION OF JESUS

KIRBY PAGE

In a public debate in the year 1858, the Rev. W. G. Brownlow said: "Not only will I throughout this discussion openly and boldly take the ground that slavery as it exists in America ought to be perpetuated, but that slavery is an established and inevitable condition of human society. I will maintain the ground that God always intended the relation of master and slave to exist, that slavery having existed ever since the first organization of society, it will exist to the end of time."

One of the great educators of that day, Chancellor William Harper, declared: "Slavery has done more to elevate a degraded race in the scale of humanity, to tame the savage, to civilize the barbarous, to soften the ferocious, to enlighten the ignorant, and to spread the blessings of Christianity among the heathen, than all the missionaries that philanthropy and religion have ever sent forth."

About the middle of the last century, the Rev. J. H. Thornwell, in referring to the slavery question, said: "The parties in this conflict are not merely abolitionists and slaveholders, they are atheists, socialists, communists, red republicans, jacobins, on the one side, and friends of order and regulated freedom, on the other. The world is the battle-ground, Christianity and Atheism the combatants, the progress of humanity the stake." While Prof. Thomas R. Dew, of William and Mary College, said: "When we turn to the New Testament, we find not one single passage at all calculated to disturb the conscience of an honest slaveholder."

These are only a few of the many thousands of historic illustrations which reveal the utter failure of many professed Christians to understand the meaning of Jesus' gospel of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man in relation to the social institutions of their day. Organized groups of Christians have with appalling frequency slaughtered multitudes of their own coreligionists, to say nothing of the fury with which they have attacked heretics and infidels. After reading the story of the religious wars, the Crusades, the Inquisition, the burning of witches, and the repeated massacres of the Jews, one can scarcely fail to reach the conclusion that the vast majority of the professed followers of Jesus have always been blind to the real meaning of his religion.

This generation also is blind. Very few of our contemporaries are able to discern the signs of the time. Just as most people in Europe were unconscious of the approaching storm in the early summer of 1914, so most Americans today are unaware of the powerful forces which are again driving the nations to the brink of war. So far as the relations of the United States with the rest of the world are concerned the situation is steadily getting worse.[1] There is a rising tide of misunderstanding, suspicion, fear, and hatred against us in Europe, in Asia, and in Latin America. Some months ago twenty thousand French veterans paraded the streets of Paris in passionate protest against our government's attitude on the debt question. Most Europeans believe that we have no moral right to ask repayment of the war loans. Furthermore, competent experts are saying that it is quite impossible for these impoverished countries to repay the vast sums involved in the funding agreements. Does any intelligent person believe that these peoples will continue for sixty-two years crushing payments

[1] See an exceedingly disturbing article by a leading journalist, Frank H. Simonds, in *American Review of Reviews*, December, 1926, pp. 627–634.

which they regard as having no moral validity? There is sufficient dynamite in this one question of debts, if ignited, to wreck the peace of the world.

The people of Japan were deeply wounded by the burning insult administered by Congress in the method of excluding their immigrants. The people of India likewise have been greatly stirred by the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court debarring Hindus from the rights of citizenship in this country, which they feel stamps them as an inferior race. Antiforeign propaganda is widespread in China and the feeling of bitterness is rapidly increasing, even against Americans. Deep resentment is being manifested in the Philippines over our failure to give them promised independence and over the vigorous campaign now being waged in this country for permanent retention of the Islands, as a valuable commercial base and source of rubber.

The steady encroachment of our financial and economic power southward is causing great alarm. Throughout the Caribbean, Central America, and Latin America, our citizens have very heavy financial and industrial holdings. We have repeatedly intervened in the political affairs of these peoples. Only last week United States marines were again landed in Nicaragua to safeguard our property interests there. We have long exercised military, political and economic control over Haiti. Within the past few days *La Nacion,* one of the great dailies of South America, launched a bitter attack on the United States and a movement has been started to boycott our merchandise in retaliation against our tariff barrier. For many months our government has been engaged in a serious controversy with Mexico over land and oil rights, and at this moment we are perilously near a break in diplomatic relations with our southern neighbor.

The financial and economic power of the United States is rapidly being extended over the world. Already our

citizens have invested twenty-two billion dollars in public and private securities abroad. Within two or three decades the rest of the world will owe us something like fifty billion dollars and we will be taking toll from every people under the sun. The result is that the United States is rapidly becoming the most feared and most hated of nations.

Moreover, the jingoes and isolationists in this country are more active than ever before. Listen, for example, to the following words from an editorial in one of our periodicals which has a circulation of a million and a quarter copies each week: "The time for discussing the right and wrong of the foreign attitude toward America is past. Only the fact that we are universally hated, counts. With all our neighbors looking for a chance to break into our melon patch, carry off the fruit, and trample the vines, it is time to train a couple of bulldogs and load the shotgun, and not to talk of brotherly love toward those who hate and despitefully use us."[1]

The movement in this country for more cordial and effective cooperation with other nations has certainly lost ground during the past year. The reservationists have prevented our entrance into the World Court and are seeking to obstruct our participation in the task of building effective international agencies. Ominous indeed is the fact that militarism—"the spirit and temper which exalts the military virtues and ideals, and minimizes the defects of military training and the cost of war and preparation for it"—is growing steadily in this country. The land is being flooded with propaganda for greater military and naval preparedness, in spite of the fact that we are already maintaining heavier armaments than ever before in time of peace. President Coolidge, in his last message to Congress, reminded the citizens of this country, "that our entire

[1] *Liberty*, Oct. 16, 1926.

permanent and reserve land and sea force trained and training consists of a personnel of about 610,000, and that our annual appropriations are about $680,000,000 a year."[1] In spite of this fact, the present administration is seeking the approval of Congress for the building of ten new cruisers. Secretary Wilbur recently pointed out that "the cost of the five cruisers building and the ten authorized will be approximately $247,000,000."

Much energy and money are being put into the campaign to extend the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in our high schools, colleges and universities. Whereas in 1912 there were only 96 institutions in this country giving courses in military training, there are now 225 such institutions. In fourteen years the number of students enrolled in these courses has increased 400 per cent, from 29,402 to 120,000. In 83 colleges and universities military training is compulsory for two years, about 52,000 students being enrolled in these compulsory courses. Approximately 7,000 high-school boys are also compelled to take military training. It is the avowed purpose of preparedness advocates to increase this number still further. The total cost to the government of the R. O. T. C. units in 1925-1926 was $10,696,054. In spite of this large appropriation, the War Department was compelled, because of insufficient funds, to refuse applications during the past year for R. O. T. C. units from 24 educational institutions.

Naval R. O. T. C. units have been started in six leading universities. If this experiment succeeds, it is planned to establish many more of these naval units. Seven colleges and universities now have special air units. The number of enrollments at the Citizens' Military Training Camps is likewise increasing. In 1914 there were only four students' military training camps, where each person paid

[1] It should be remembered that $680,000,000 represents the gross expenditures of the army and navy and includes non-military and non-naval expenses totaling about one hundred millions.

his own expenses; in 1921 there were 12 citizens' military training camps, and in 1926 there were 40 such camps, with more than 33,000 persons enrolled, with all expenses paid by the Government. From the War Department Notes of Nov. 23, 1926, we learn that there was a "total of 207,825 persons engaged in military training in Continental United States in the summer of 1926."[1]

Only the blindest of the blind can fail to see that further travel down the road of suspicion, fear, bitterness, hatred, and armaments will lead to the precipice of war and devastation. Yet the startling fact is that so few people are doing anything to change the direction in which this nation is now traveling. Blindly and carelessly we are staggering on toward the chasm.

What Can An Individual Do About It?

1. *Be Intelligent Concerning the Causes of War.*—There is no effective substitute for understanding. Zeal without knowledge may only increase our danger. In our time wars arise primarily because the political organization of mankind fails to keep pace with our economic requirements. Each person in this room, therefore, is under obligation to examine carefully the roots of industrialism and nationalism. The rise of the factory system and the growth of industrialism have made the peoples of the various parts of the world interdependent to an unprecedented degree.[2] They simply cannot get along without each other. Industrial countries must secure large quantities of raw materials —coal, iron, oil, rubber, timber, food, etc.—from outside their own boundaries and must sell their surplus products to other peoples. They must also find an outlet for their

[1] For full information concerning military training, write to the Committee on Militarism in Education, Bible House, Astor Place, New York City; see *The World Tomorrow*, October, 1926.

[2] See "Imperialism and World Politics," by Parker T. Moon; "Foreign Trade and World Politics," by Herbert F. Fraser; and "The Origin of the Next War," by John Bakeless.

surplus savings, or the rate of interest will fall with serious financial consequences. Maximum prosperity depends, therefore, upon the continuous flow of raw materials, manufactured products, and money throughout the world.

The fear of being denied access to raw materials and markets, and the desire to secure a favored position with regard to these economic resources, are the primary causes of imperialism and militarism. In order to succeed in the economic rivalry with other countries, industrial nations have frequently seized control of backward countries. In this way most of Africa, much of Asia and many islands of the sea have been annexed by Western powers. In recent years economic imperialism has been more pronounced than the effort to secure colonies, and it is in this field that the United States has been especially active.

This bitter competition between the citizens of the various countries would be a source of great danger under any form of political organization, but under the existing political system it is a constant source of violent combat. Humanity is now divided into more or less artificial units called nations. Nationalism is not based primarily on race, language, geography, common economic interests, religion, or culture. While all these factors are important elements in nationalism, the real cement that holds people together within a nation is sentiment. Nationalism is an emotion, a state of mind, a psychological experience. It has many noble aspects and is frequently constructive and creative.

Unfortunately, however, nationalism frequently is divisive and destructive.[1] It often binds people together in such a way as to make them antagonistic to other groups. Each nation emphasizes the points at which it differs from other peoples, exaggerates its own virtues, and underestimates its own faults, while depreciating the good qualities of other nations and grossly distorting their vices. More-

[1] For the most stimulating discussion of this subject see "Essays on Nationalism," by CARLTON J. H. HAYES.

over, the ideas of national sovereignty and national honor are two of the most menacing aspects of the world situation. It is almost universally believed that a nation is an ultimate political unit, that there is not and should not be any law higher than the law of a nation. It is further assumed that the primary duty of a nation is to safeguard its own people and advance their welfare, without being obliged to consider the rights and interests of other nations. In its extreme form, nationalism leads to international anarchy—the absence of government by due process of law between nations.[1] Anarchy is the supreme enemy of security and justice.

Nations are still in the duelling stage. An insult to our flag or any action that threatens our prestige stirs the passions of war. People scarcely ever stop to ask: Is our country really dishonored by what others say about us or by having our national symbol treated disrespectfully? Citizens of Indiana do not feel called upon to go to war against Ohioans who slander their state. If a native of California is killed in Oregon, there is no demand for an armed march upon the latter state. Yet the refusal on the part of Mexico, for example, to apologize for an alleged insult to our national honor and to salute our flag is regarded as a sufficient cause for war by a large proportion of our population.

The beginning step in the peace program of each one of us, therefore, should be the realization that economic competition and extreme nationalism are the chief causes of modern wars, and that fundamental changes must not only be made in the present economic order, but also in the prevailing conception of national sovereignty and national honor.

2. *Help Break Down the Mental and Emotional Barriers Between Peoples.*—This is of supreme importance and each

[1] See an important book, "International Anarchy," by G. Lowes Dickinson, a study of the causes of the World War.

one of us has a twofold responsibility; first, to make sure that in our own personal relations with individuals of other races and nationalities we reflect the genuine spirit of brotherhood; and, second, to aid in the creation of a public opinion which will transform the more impersonal relations of our nation with other nations. If the Christian students of the United States really cared about universal brotherhood they would exert themselves more seriously to form abiding friendships with the thousands of foreign students now enrolled in our educational institutions. Many of these students from other lands have been subjected to such discrimination, insult, and persecution that they have become embittered and cynical. Then, too, there are millions of other persons of foreign birth in this country, with whom all of us have more or less frequent personal contacts. We cannot escape the responsibility that rests upon us to treat these people as members of a common family.

Modern life is becoming more and more impersonal. Much of our present-day sinning is done at long range. Each one of us, however, has a direct responsibility for the creation of the kind of public opinion which will break down the mental and emotional barriers erected by nationalism. Here is an educational task of great magnitude, requiring thousands of trained teachers and millions of dollars. Histories must be rewritten, with a full account of the faults and excesses of the country in which they are used, and with sincere appreciation of the virtues and achievements of other peoples. Imaginations must be stimulated and sympathies deepened. The common characteristics and parallel aspirations of the various peoples must be stressed and the essential unity of mankind emphasized.

The need for international education by the various governments is so obvious that it ought not to be necessary to mention it. Yet amazingly little is actually being done about it. Our Federal government is spending more than five bil-

lion dollars a decade getting ready to wage war and only a paltry sum in waging peace. Would it not be wise to have a peace department as well as a war department? This idea was suggested more than 125 years ago and has been revived frequently. Beginning in 1909 we did have for a short time an Assistant Secretary of Peace in our Department of State. Dr. David Starr Jordan has recently urged the formation of a Bureau of Conciliation in the Department of State.[1] Some months ago I set apart several days for the purpose of considering the question as to how an amount equivalent to our expenditures on the army and navy could wisely be spent on education for peace. I was amazed to discover that I could think of no ways of wisely spending $550,000,000 annually on peace education. The best I could do was to draft a rough budget totaling one fifth of this amount.[2]

According to my rough estimate a national peace budget of approximately one hundred million dollars annually would provide for the following major items: A Department of Peace, with a Secretary of Peace and an adequate staff; 10 regional offices in the United States, each with 10 regional secretaries; 40 foreign offices, each with 5 foreign secretaries; an editor-in-chief of peace publications and an adequate staff; the free circulation of a million copies of a monthly peace magazine; the free circulation of 12,000,000 copies of peace booklets annually; the distribution of a huge quantity of peace posters; the production of 20 peace moving-picture films each year; the free distribution of 50 selected books on international problems to 20,000 libraries; the support of 10,000 American students abroad, and 10,000 foreign students in our colleges and universities; the support of 200 American professors abroad, and 200 for-

[1] For a full account of this proposal see "Ways to Peace," edited by Esther Everett Lape, of the Bok Peace Award, pp. 257–274.

[2] For the details of this budget see "A National Peace Department," by KIRBY PAGE, which may be secured for 10c. from the Council of Christian Associations, 600 Lexington Ave., New York.

eign professors in this country; the maintenance of an International University, including scholarships for 2,000 students; the maintenance of 1,000 professors of international relations in American colleges and 5,000 such professors in our high schools; the maintenance of 100 summer camps and the payment of the camp expenses of 40,000 young men and women each year, the promotion of an annual peace day, the conducting of 20 World Friendship Cruises annually, the erection of peace monuments, and the support of numerous international projects. All this for approximately one hundred million dollars per year.

3. *Aid in Developing a New Technique of Handling International Disputes.*—The number of disputes between nations is increasing rapidly, as a result of closer contacts and a greater degree of interdependence. If war and destruction are to be avoided, nations must acquire the habit of conferring about their conflicting interests and of reaching cooperative solutions. Two illustrations will reveal the difference between the method now so frequently used and the new technique which is so desperately needed. The first one has to do with the interallied debts. More bitterness and hatred are being generated by this question than by any other single problem of the hour. The whole matter is exceedingly complicated and is bound up with the question of German reparations. Ever since the armistice, England has been urging the calling of an international conference to consider all phases of the reparations-debt problem. The Government of the United States has taken the position that the allied debts are legal obligations and are therefore independent of reparations. This is technically true but no permanent solution of the debt question is possible apart from a satisfactory adjustment of reparations. The least that we ought to do is to be willing to participate in such a conference and to be ready to do whatever needs to be done in the light of all the economic, political and psychological facts.

In their important pronouncement on the debt question published widely on Dec. 20, 1926, the 42 Columbia professors said: "In our judgment the war debts settlements are unsound in principle. Certainly they have created and are fostering a deep sense of grievance against us. We do not agree that the debts be completely cancelled. Whether there should be cancellation in whole or only in part depends on many complicated factors yet to be studied. What we do urge is complete reconsideration in the light of present knowledge. To this end we believe that an international conference should be called to review the entire problem of debt payments and make proposals for readjustment." At present our Government has a fatal habit of giving rigid and binding instructions to our delegates before they sail, with orders to withdraw from the conference if our terms are not met. It is obvious that if the other delegates are thus instructed, all of them might as well have stayed at home. What we need is the habit of conference.

The other illustration is found in the manner in which Congress excluded Japanese immigrants. What we did was to make an arbitrary, insulting decision that deeply wounded a very sensitive people. If Congress previously had acquired the habit of conference, it would have been a simple matter to have settled the whole question in a way that would have been satisfactory to us and to them. If Japan had been put on the quota basis, on terms of equality with other nations, only 146 Japanese immigrants would have been eligible to enter each year. Because we did not choose to confer, we have sown fertile seeds of misunderstanding and hostility.

These are only two of hundreds of similar illustrations. Irregular conferences are not an adequate method of dealing with so great a multitude of urgent problems as are now confronting the various governments. Permanent and comprehensive international agencies are required. This

is why the effort of the League of Nations, the World Court, the International Labor Office, and such bodies are so extremely important to the peace of the world.[1] The habit of cooperative decision is the price of peace and we must not become weary or discouraged in our efforts to bring about a change in our national policy with regard to permanent agencies of international justice.

4. *Help Create Confidence in Peaceable Agencies and Non-Violent Sanctions.*—International agencies will be unable to deal effectively with periodic crises unless we can build up in the respective countries an expectation of the peaceable settlement of even the most serious disputes. The present psychology of warlike settlement in any time of crisis leaves us at the mercy of jingoes and must be replaced by the conviction on the part of great masses of people that international agencies are better able to deal satisfactorily with grave disputes than are national armies and navies.

Moreover, the idea of the use of armed forces by international bodies must be repudiated. Instead of relying upon national or international armaments, we must create confidence in non-violent sanctions or means of enforcing international decisions. In this connection it is illuminating to recall that the Supreme Court of the United States has functioned successfully for 139 years without ever calling upon any of our armed forces for help in enforcing its decisions against a state. Much confusion could be avoided if we would recognize the vast difference between using physical force against an individual or small group, on the one hand, and against organized bodies like states or nations, on the other. The supposed analogy between the police and the army is utterly misleading. Some other means of dealing with criminals would have been found long ago if it were necessary to kill a hundred

[1] For full information concerning these agencies, write to the League of Nations Non-partisan Association, 6 East 39 St., New York City

innocent persons for every lawbreaker apprehended and if the presence of police forces generated as much fear, hatred and violence as does the presence of armies. International decisions, like those of our Supreme Court, cannot safely be enforced by violence, but must rely upon the honor of peoples, the power of organized public opinion, diplomatic measures, and in extreme cases, upon economic and financial pressure.[1] Cynicism concerning the efficacy of international agencies must be replaced by a far greater degree of confidence in such processes before peace can be assured.

5. *Help Destroy the War System.*—At the present time the right to declare war is regarded as one of the inalienable rights of a sovereign nation. This right has heretofore been recognized by international law. That is to say, war has been the legal way of settling international disputes. In the Locarno treaties, France, Germany, and Belgium have agreed to settle all disputes peaceably, even questions of national honor and vital interest; that is, they have relinquished the sovereign right to declare war, and henceforth war between them is illegal, it is outlawed.[2] The fact that they have reserved the right to defend themselves in case of attack and to participate in the administering of armed sanctions by the League of Nations weakens these agreements, but they do constitute a long step forward. This idea needs to be extended to all the powers and an all-inclusive outlawry treaty negotiated and ratified. The making of war illegal would not necessarily stop all attacks of one nation upon another, any more than laws against murder prevent all killing. But such an agreement would very greatly reduce the probability of aggression.

The responsibility of the individual, however, does not

[1] For a fuller discussion of sanctions see "An American Peace Policy," pp. 23–35, by KIRBY PAGE, 15c.

[2] For the text of these treaties see "Final Protocol of the Locarno Conference," 5c., Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 405 West 117 St., New York City.

end with the advocacy of the outlawry of war by governments. Each one of us must make a decision concerning his own relationship to the war system. As for myself, I decided more than ten years ago, before the United States entered the great conflict, that to the utmost of my ability I must disentangle myself from the war system. For a number of reasons, I decided that I ought not to sanction, support, or participate in any war. By this is meant, I should not give my approval to any war or serve as a soldier or engage in active war service in any destructive capacity. I certainly do not have any scruples against relieving the sufferings of those who are engaged in the conflict, if this could be done without becoming a part of the war machine. No person can dissociate himself entirely from the consequences of war when the conflict is on, but so far as I have direct responsibility and control, I will never sanction or support any war.

My reasons for this drastic decision are briefly as follows: The evidence seems conclusive that war is futile as a means of attempting the settlement of international disputes, is ineffective as a way of achieving security and justice, is a prolific source of further conflicts, is rapidly becoming suicidal, is a combination of the major evils of our day, is utterly contrary to the teaching and example of Jesus and is the supreme denial of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.[1] I am wholly unable to reconcile the attitudes and practices inherently involved in war with Jesus' way of life, and for me to sanction or participate in war would mean the abandonment and renunciation of his religion.

The place where this question most directly touches students in many colleges and universities is with regard to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps. What should a student do about the R. O. T. C.? I do not presume to

[1] For an elaboration of this point of view see "The Abolition of War," by SHERWOOD EDDY and KIRBY PAGE, 15c.

answer for anyone else, but so far as I can see the R. O. T. C. is an organic part of the war system and must be included in one's evaluation of the entire system. Certainly the compulsory feature to be found in many institutions is foreign to the oldest and best American traditions. The deadly thing about the R. O. T. C. seems to me to be this, not that it makes students aggressive and bloodthirsty, but that its net result on the campus and in the community is to increase confidence in the war method, to arouse suspicion and fear of other nations, and especially to increase the degree of cynicism concerning peaceable means of maintaining security and justice.

6. *Help Create a Truer Type of Patriotism.*—Too long have we allowed militarists and jingoes to claim a monopoly of patriotism. Was Jesus a patriot? Before we can answer, it will be necessary to agree upon a definition of patriotism. The important elements in patriotism seem to me to be love for the people who dwell in one's country and devotion to the highest ideals of one's nation. By this standard, Jesus was the preeminent patriot of his day, although he refused to take up violent weapons against the despoilers of his people. If the war system is one of the chief enemies of mankind and its perpetuation will again bring destruction and misery upon the people of this and other lands, is it patriotic or unpatriotic to support it? The evidence convinces me that on sheer grounds of patriotism we ought to repudiate and abandon the war system. The truest patriot is that man or woman who most completely reproduces Jesus' way of life, who does most to reconcile the warring factions of God's family.

7. *Take Jesus Seriously in International Affairs.*—Loyalty to the religion of Jesus obligates each one of us to seek the ends which he sought and to use methods which are consistent with these ends. The great tragedy of history and of contemporary life is that professed Christians, in their group relations, have usually rejected the tactics

of Jesus. It cannot be doubted that the method of Jesus in dealing with offenders was to overcome evil with good. It is equally obvious that organized groups have rarely used this method of maintaining security and justice. Herein is found the reason why we are still confronted with the imminent peril of war. Nothing is of greater importance than that this generation should recognize the full significance of Jesus' tactics and in all spheres of life resolutely adhere to his method of overcoming evil.

The tactics of Jesus cannot really be understood apart from a knowledge of the historical circumstances under which he lived.[1] Of course, Jesus was a Jew, a citizen of a country that throughout his entire lifetime was in bondage to Rome. The whole life of his people—politically, economically, religiously—was dominated by Roman officials of various kinds. The Jews were a very sensitive people, hating tyranny and loving freedom to an unsurpassed degree. In the days of Jesus they were filled with an intense expectation of the coming of the Messiah, the son of David their great military hero, who should lead them in overthrowing the conqueror and in restoring the ancient glories of Israel. Armed rebellions against Rome were frequent and continuous, several of which are referred to in the New Testament record. Do we not read of the Galileans "whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices"? Are not two revolutionary leaders, Theudas and Judas, mentioned by name?[2] Among Jesus' own disciples there was at least one sworn advocate of violent revolt.

A knowledge of the historical setting of which Jesus was a part, and a study of the record of his life, make it unmistakably clear that the preeminent problem for the

[1] The most revealing account of the essential facts is probably that of Prof. V. G. Simkhovitch in his little book, "Toward the Understanding of Jesus," which may be secured for 25c. from Kirby Page, 347 Madison Ave., New York City.

[2] In this connection see "Was Jesus a Patriot?" by Kirby Page, 5c. See also "The Constructive Revolution of Jesus," by Samuel Dickey.

Jews of that day was how to recover their freedom. It was into such a situation that Jesus came with his challenge to overcome evil with good, that is, to live the family life at all times and under all circumstances, depend upon incarnated love, forgiveness and sacrifice for victory, and be willing to take the consequences. Evildoers, enemies, Romans: these words were synonymous to the Jews. No wonder they chose one of their national heroes, Barabbas, "who for a certain insurrection made in the city, and for murder, was cast into prison," and demanded the crucifixion of the one who had said: "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, bless them that curse you, pray for them that despitefully use you."

By word and deed, Jesus repudiated the pagan doctrine of eye for eye.[1] He would not forsake his own way of overcoming evil even to lead his people against Rome, as Judas Maccabeas had so brilliantly done in a previous generation. Instead, he went about doing good, living consistently as a true member of God's family, loving, serving, trusting, forgiving, suffering, rejoicing. He would not abandon this manner of life even to avoid crucifixion. In his scale of values consistent devotion to an ideal was more important than his own life.

When we look at the Cross of Calvary, therefore, we see God's way and Jesus' way of overcoming evil.[2] In a wicked world where there is a struggle between the un-

[1] To refer to the scene in the temple, when he drove out the money changers, as proof that under certain circumstances Jesus sanctions war and bloodshed is to read into this passage more than is really there. In the American Revised version this passage reads: "and he made a scourge of cords, and cast all out of the temple, *both the sheep and the oxen*, and he poured out the changers' money, and overthrew their tables." While Moffatt's Translation reads: "Making a scourge of cords, he drove them all, sheep and cattle, together, out of the temple, scattered the coins of the brokers and upset their tables." Notice the record does not say that he used the scourge on the men.

[2] For a further discussion of this point see "The Sword or the Cross," by KIRBY PAGE, 15c.

righteous and the righteous, someone must suffer, someone must die. Self-preservation is the first law of life, declares the pagan. But on the cross Jesus says it is better for the innocent to die, if need be, than to abandon the family life by killing the guilty. God being what He is, and man being what he is, this is the way to overcome evil and to build the Family of God. Here we have the supreme challenge of Jesus to his disciples in every age: overcome evil with good, love your enemies, forgive seventy times seven, take up your cross and follow me.

The response that you young people make to this challenge is of incalculable significance. What the three thousand of you do, or fail to do, in the years ahead may determine whether this beloved country of ours is to do its full part in promoting international conciliation and cooperation, or whether it is to become the greatest of all menaces to international friendship and peace.

Two courses are open to each one of you. If you so choose you may consume your time and energy in the pursuit of comforts and luxuries, physical thrills and pleasures, blind and indifferent to the international perils of the hour. The generation before you made such a choice, with the result that these last years have brought forth indescribable human agony and misery. If this college generation drifts on, unseeing and unheeding, you and your children will pay in tears and blood. The sober truth is that at this hour the nations of the world, including the United States, by manifesting the attitudes and engaging in the practices which produced the World War, are rushing surely and swiftly on toward another great disaster, if left unchecked. Yes, if you so desire, you can fritter away your energies on the irrelevancies of life—and wake up some morning before you die to find the world in flames.

But you are also free to become an intelligent, enthusiastic crusader for international understanding, friend-

ship and cooperation. *If you so desire you can dedicate yourself to the task of breaking down the barriers that separate peoples from each other, of developing a new technique of handling international disputes, of creating confidence in peaceable methods and agencies, of destroying the war system, of creating a truer type of patriotism, of taking Jesus seriously.* There is an urgent need for trained men and women, disciplined in mind and spirit, as educators, journalists, diplomatists, clergymen, statesmen, religious educators, lawyers, missionaries, business men, who will create the attitudes and agencies of international peace and justice.

There are enough of you in this room to turn the tide against war during the next three decades if only you will consecrate yourselves unreservedly to this great cause. Many of us have long been praying that out of this memorable gathering there might emerge a group of students who, in the realms of economic, racial, international, political, and social relations, would do a work comparable with the achievements of the leaders of the Student Volunteer Movement and the world-wide missionary enterprise in the previous generation. The same spiritual resources are open to you that were accessible to them and to the leaders of the great liberating movement through the ages. God being what He is, man being what he is, you can do it if you will!

THE DIVINE POSSIBILITIES OF HUMAN LIFE

X

JESUS' VIEW OF THE DIVINE POSSIBILITIES OF HUMAN LIFE

HAROLD C. PHILLIPS

It seems to me that there could be no greater indication of the state of flux or experimentation in the student world today than the fact that so many young men have been given an important place on the program. I have really felt very concerned about this, and the first thing I did last night was to inquire how the conference was progressing, and the Chairman of the meeting said, "Perfectly splendidly. In fact, it seems too good to be true. I think that something will have to happen before the conference is over to mar somewhat the standard we have attained." I just felt then and there that perhaps I should not have left home because I might spoil their best hopes.

I am sure that none of us comes in the capacity of those who would give fatherly advice. We come rather in the capacity of students who, like you, are trying to think through some of the implications of Jesus' Gospel, to discover, if possible, his way amid the maze of things, and, having found it, to follow it.

As you have noticed from the program, we are beginning tonight the third cycle of our discussion, and I have been asked to speak to you upon the subject, "The Faith of Jesus in the Divine Possibilities of Human Nature." It was Voltaire who once said, "If you would converse with me, define your terms." There is only one term in our subject which possibly needs definition, and that is the word divine. By divine I mean, as I think you do, God-like, or Christ-like. Perhaps we might say that the divine nature is hu-

man nature in its highest and best expression. I have sometimes heard people say as they have listened to an orchestra at work on some great symphony, "That music was heavenly!" Heavenly music, divine music, is music in its highest and finest expression. So is the divine nature. It is human nature at its best, perfectly expressed, because it is in tune with the life of God as made known by Christ.

Now I would like to discuss this theme from the viewpoint of fact rather than of theory, that is from a historic, rather than a philosophic, point of view. In our hands, Christianity faces constantly this predicament that its theoretical or philosophic claims are frequently not reconciled with facts. We accept the ethics of Jesus, the teaching of Jesus. We sit in our classrooms, or our studies, and we travel along swimmingly, borne up by the swells, until presently we strike a reef, some concrete situation, and we are frequently stumped. The waters seem to recede; we are left high and dry. We believe in a gospel of love, and suddenly we are confronted with some unlovely situation, and frequently our gospel pitiably fails in encompassing it. In other words, we are constantly conscious of a kind of divorce between philosophy and history, theory and fact, knowledge and being, a divorce of which I think Jesus was scarcely ever conscious.

As we come, therefore, to think of the faith that Jesus had in the divine possibilities of human nature, it occurred to me that the whole theme might be more forcibly presented if I were to select two or three historic concrete instances from the gospels, to show that Jesus held this faith not in some weak solution of sentiment, but that it was invariably precipitated in concrete human situations in life.

Jesus did not live up to his teaching; he lived it. The teaching of Jesus was a teaching of life through life. There was nothing theoretical about it. The Gospel is not bound in a book, but in a man. As one has said, "Jesus taught life itself, not how to live, but life."

First of all, it seems to me that Jesus had a profound faith in the ability of human beings to apprehend spiritual truth, for of course if the divine life or divine truth cannot be apprehended, it cannot be imparted. Paul said that the natural man could not understand the things of the spirit, that they had to be spiritually discerned. That is true. Jesus had a profound faith in the capacity of even the lowest for spiritual discernment.

Let me illustrate this by a concrete situation which he once faced. I am referring to the story of Jesus and the woman at the well of Samaria. He was going through Samaria on his way from Judea to Galilee. As he was sitting at Jacob's well, a woman of Samaria came to draw water. There are many approaches to the story and many lessons that it may teach; but is not one of the outstanding lessons, implied if not expressed in that story, the faith of Jesus in the capacity of that woman to apprehend spiritual truth? Think of the woman, no culture, no refinement, no education, and according to the story, no moral standards. We would describe her as a bad character.

Think of what Jesus said to her. In a word he gave to her some of the keenest revelations of truth and the most spiritual of his religious concepts. He told her of the "water of life." He said to her some things about God that he had not even mentioned to his disciples. He said to her, "God is a spirit." We are tempted to save our finest utterances and our ablest thought for our largest or most cultured audiences. I am sorry I made that confession, because I am afraid at the close you may say if this is an example of my finest utterances and ablest thought, what must my congregation suffer. However, what an example was this of Jesus giving his best to human life at its worst.

This is not an isolated instance. He brought the fullness of his Gospel not only to this outcast member of a despised race, the Samaritans, but to other classes of people regarded as equally degraded, illiterate, "common" people, the

publicans and the sinners. In so doing Jesus identified himself with all humanity and broke all the conventions of his age. May I suggest as a possible topic for group discussion: whether the motive which led Jesus to make these contacts is anything like the impulse which prompts many of us young people to break the conventions of our day.

Why did he do it? It may be that he went on the assumption that the brightest lights ought to be lit in the darkest places or that the choicest spiritual food should be saved for those in greatest hunger. That may be true. But is this not also an indication of the great faith that Jesus had that his words would not be wasted to the winds, but that that character, bad as it was, had the capacity for apprehending truth? He believed that there was a chamber in her heart for God, if only he could discover the right key, that there was a chord in her nature that could be set into sympathetic vibration, if only he could strike the right note, that there was a live coal in her being that could be coaxed into a flame if only he could uncover it.

Why was it that Christ believed that the woman could apprehend spiritual truth? I think because she was in such desperate need. What Jesus saw in her was not so much the grossness of her guilt as the greatness of her need. For example, a child in constant and wilful disobedience to its parents plays with the fire and is badly burned. What the mother sees as she looks at the child is not so much the wrong that the child has done as it is the sore fingers and inflamed skin that the child's disobedience has brought. Seeing only the child's wrong the mother would condemn. Seeing its need, she tries to help it. One is a negative, easy, ethic, the other is positive. It is hard. Christ is not the world's condemner, but the world's Saviour. He sees not simply the world's guilt, but the need which that very guilt has brought. The faith of Jesus in the capacity of human nature, even at its worst, to apprehend spiritual truth is based upon the clearness with which he saw the immediate

and pressing needs of human life. A drowning man will catch even at a straw, provided he can be convinced that he is drowning. It is not to his folly, but to his peril that Christ appeals. It is help, not condemnation that Christ offers. Of course, Jesus was never thoroughly understood. Even his disciples did not understand him. We may believe that the disciples of Jesus clung to him not because they understood him but because they loved him. Love covers a multitude of sins, even spiritual dullness.

This, then, is the first avenue of approach along which one discovers the faith of Jesus in our divine possibilities. Only thus can we explain the great paradoxes of his thought. Think of some of them:

"The first shall be last and the last shall be first."

"To him that hath shall be given."

"He that loseth his life shall find it."

"He that would be greatest among you, let him become the servant of all."

These great truths are not simply academic. They appeal not simply to our intellect, but to our imagination and insight, indeed to our whole life. The very incompleteness of life apart from them leads us to them. The faith of Jesus in our ability to apprehend them is based upon his consciousness of the emptiness of life without them. It is the faith that a hungry man when offered food will eat, that the defenseless driven by the storm will seek shelter, and that those whose deepest needs are not met by Jacob's well will seek the "water of life."

There is another approach. The faith of Jesus in the divine possibilities of human life is shown in this other daring way. Jesus believes that spiritual truth when apprehended can and does radically change human life. It may be a nice question for debate as to which is cause and which effect. That is to say, whether it is the apprehension of truth that changes human conduct or the changed human life that apprehends truth.

It is the lifelong debate as to which goes through the barn door first, the bullet or the hole. This does not concern us. What does concern us is the result.

Let me illustrate this faith of Jesus by reminding you of another concrete situation. I am referring to the interview between Jesus and Nicodemus. The difference between Nicodemus and the character of whom we have just spoken is so great that it is worth noting. She was a poor peasant. He was the wealthiest man in all Jewry, an aristocrat in the finest sense of the term. She was an outcast; he one of the most respectable and responsible men of his day. She had no background of culture or refinement. Nicodemus was called "the teacher." He was one of the intellectual lights of his day. He would have felt at home in this company. (I may be paying him a doubtful compliment.) The ability of Jesus to meet and minister with equal effectiveness to two characters who were literally poles apart in their thinking and their needs is simply another illustration of the catholicity of his culture, the enormous breadth and versatility of his God-like spirit, and the universality of his gospel which even today can encompass all of life.

The words of Jesus to Nicodemus are tremendously significant for our thought. This is what Jesus said to this thoroughly educated and wealthy man, "Nicodemus, you must be born again. Your whole nature can and must be changed." Can you wonder that Nicodemus was stumped? He soliloquized, "How can a man be born when he is old? How can these things be?"

Notice this, that the problem of Nicodemus was not a moral one, as in the case of the woman, but rather intellectual. He had apprehended the truth of Jesus' teachings. He said to Jesus, "Rabbi: we know that thou art a teacher come from God." Nicodemus' difficulty was that he was willing to carry around these truths simply as matters of academic interest. He could not see either the necessity or the possibility of the Gospel actually changing his nature or

his conduct. "How can a man be born when he is old? How can these things be?" Is it necessary and is it possible? Is it?

I hardly think I need to labor the point with a group such as this, that to change human nature is an absolute necessity. By our very presence at this conference we have expressed our interest in things outside of ourselves, things of a social nature. We want to help change the world. That is why we are here, and if it isn't, we ought not to be here. That is what brought us here. There is only one thing that will ever change the world, and that is changed men. God knows we are not lacking in schemes for social and international betterment. We have blueprints aplenty. What we lack now is the men with the courage and the faith to begin the construction.

I was speaking to a man recently who is a member of a church. He said he would not send his children to a certain high school because there were some Negroes who were students there. How hopeless are all schemes for interracial cooperation when we feel like that. That man is nominally a Christian; there are vast sections of the kingdom of God which he will never even see until he is born again.

Granted the necessity, the other question is, "Is it possible?" How can human nature be made God-like? That was Nicodemus' question, "How can a man be born when he is old? How can these things be?"

I think that this question Nicodemus asked finds a very sympathetic ear in our age and generation. We are living in what has been accurately called a scientific age, and the prevailing insistent question of science is the question how. Things hitherto considered far too sacred to be questioned are now on the witness stand and are undergoing a cross-examination as insistent as it is merciless. We are no longer satisfied blindly to accept the universe. We are first of all seeking to understand it. We have to be shown.

All of us here tonight are delegates from Missouri in that respect. Our intellectual honesty has to be satisfied before our emotional nature makes any response. "How can these things be?"

I wish I had an hour tonight rather than my poor little thirty-five minutes which are almost gone. Let me just suggest this. I think we ought to be guarded against the error of refusing a product simply because we do not fully understand a process. I think it is a fact that the truly scientific mind realizes that there are some things that must remain mysteries, even in the world of nature, to say nothing of the world of spirit. We study chemistry, but we cannot comprehend the unseen laws which guide the delicate actions and reactions of matter. We eat food, but no man has found the point exactly at which food passes from dead nourishment into life. We use electricity, but its true nature still remains a mystery.

Without trying, therefore, to explain the mystery of regeneration, let me say that I can see at least three distinct steps in the process by which the Gospel of Jesus, the life of Jesus, actually changes human life. First, Christ changes us by helping us to overcome our inertia. He does this by revealing to us just what we are. He has the supreme power of revealing a life to itself. "He stirreth up the people," said his accusers, and no individual is ever changed until he is stirred up, disturbed. His life disturbs us by showing us just what we are. Furthermore, he shows us what we might become. His character not only disturbs us; it lures us. In him we see what we might be, we press toward the mark, the full-grown man, the measure of the fullness of the stature of Christ. He reveals to us God, the source of his divine nature, and of ours.

Whether such thoughts entered the mind of Christ I do not know. Of one thing I am certain, that the faith of Jesus in the possibility of human nature being changed was

based on this fact; namely, that a thing which was morally necessary was actually possible. He believed in a rational world governed by a loving God. If it was morally necessary for human nature to be changed, then with God it was possible. He believed that it was no more impossible for a man to be born again than for him to be born at all, that God, who had given life, could add to life, and that is what regeneration is, more life, abundant life.

The faith of Jesus has been abundantly vindicated. There is no fact that has a greater accumulation of proof than that the Gospel of Jesus can and does change human nature, beyond all possibilities of prediction. It changed Paul the persecutor into Paul the Apostle, Augustine the sinner into Augustine the Saint, Newton the miscreant into Newton the missionary, Jerry McAuley the river thief into Jerry McAuley an apostle to the lost. What it has done it can do. "You can't change human nature," is the doleful cry of the pessimist. "You must change human nature," is the moral imperative of Christ. And because it must be, with God it can be. "According to your faith be it unto you."

There is one other thing that I would suggest. Jesus' faith in our divine possibilities is shown first in the fact that we can apprehend spiritual truth; second, that truth when apprehended can radically change human nature. And now let me suggest this other thing. Jesus believes that human nature when changed is capable of endless creativity.

Let me remind you of another concrete situation. He was walking one day along the seashore and saw a fisherman, Peter. He said to him, "Follow me, and I will make you to become a fisher of men." The thing to which Jesus really called this man, as history has shown, was to a new task of creative endeavor.

I have at home the picture of an old tree, the General Sherman. It is advertised by the National Geographic

Society as being the oldest living thing. It antedates the Christian era by 2,000 years and may live for another 2,000 years. I know some things, however, that will outlive that tree. Plato will outlive it; so will Tennyson; so will Raphael. After it has fallen the Sistine Madonna will still be inspiring mankind. Beethoven will outlive it. The Fifth Symphony will never die. Lincoln will outlive it. His thoughts will not perish as long as man thinks.

You see there are two kinds of life. There is the life of the tree measured in length of days, and the life of man calculated not in length of days, but in quality of being. Now that immortal spirit of creativity which one finds in the poet, the artist, the man of genius, Jesus believed was possible for all mankind. The divine life is always a creative life. Peter, the fisherman, would long since have been forgotten, but Peter, the fisher of men, became a creator. He started a movement which will outlive the stars. He planted a seed which knows no autumn, but an eternal spring.

There is at least one tremendous difference between the Old and the New Testament. The keynote of the Old Testament is possession. The keyword of the New Testament is creation. Yonder across the Jordan was the land of Canaan. Moses was sent out to possess it. Jesus, however, sent his disciples upon a bigger and a harder mission than that. They were sent out not to possess the world that was, but to create a new world that was not, a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.

I have heard our nation described as a nation of go-getters. The thing is there, go get it! That's human nature, but a man has not discovered the highest function of his personality nor the Christ-appointed purpose of his life until he sees himself not simply as a possessor of things that are, but primarily as the creator of things that are not. Christ could very easily have become the possessor of the world that was. It was freely offered him. One of his

severe trials at the time of his temptation was that he was offered "the kingdoms of the world and all the glory of them." But he refused it because his creative spirit encompassed a greater task, namely, the creation of a world that was not. He called it the kingdom of God. He gave up certainty for uncertainty, safety for adventure, Canaan for the Cross. That is always the nature of the divine creative life.

Fellow students, do we share in this creative purpose? Have we become so much a part of the picture that is that we would rather not mar it by changing it? Have we grown so accustomed to war, to unjust racial discriminations, to social injustice, to industrial strife, to the misrepresentation of truth, that we see in such things simply the inevitable rather than the redeemable? "Greater works than these shall he do." Such was the faith of Jesus.

You see there are two sides to this picture, a subjective and an objective. The climax of Jesus' faith in the divine possibilities of human nature is his confidence in the kingdom of God, an objective reality for which he died. The very fact that this is an objective fact appeals to us. We can in a sense see it. It challenges us. Our first impulse is to roll up our sleeves and go right to it. But that is not an effective way. It cometh not with observation. The disciples tried that way and were rebuked. The divine kingdom must be brought by divine methods, and this is the divine method, that the objective reality must come not by working from without in, but from within out.

Jesus believed that the new order of outward being was but the necessary consequence of the new order of inward being. Neither the woman nor Nicodemus could have had a share in the creating of this objective reality without subjectively apprehending spiritual truth and being changed by its apprehension. The objective event will be brought to pass only by its subjective attainment; the experience of the kingdom within must precede the condition of the

kingdom without. "The kingdom of heaven is within you."

This, then, in part is the confidence that Jesus has reposed in us and his hopes for us. His faith reveals not only the ultimate wisdom of a perfect teacher, but the love of a perfect brother. It is the faith that we may all become sons of God. The simplest cannot misunderstand it, and the wisest cannot add to it.

The presence of twenty-five hundred students in Milwaukee seeking again the resources of the life of Christ for our day is splendid evidence of the fact that the faith of Jesus in us is founded in reality and will not be frustrated permanently; that it is an illusion, but has an enduring basis in reality. Although the night is dark, the day will break.

XI

THE CHANGING CONCEPTION OF GOD AND OF DUTY

ROBERT A. MILLIKAN

Members of the Conference, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have had a good deal of difficulty in meeting this appointment this morning, but I was very anxious to do so because as I see it the group here represented has a larger capacity for moving on the wheels of intelligent progress in the United States than has perhaps any other group of like number in the country, and with the capacity for moving on the wheels of progress goes inevitably the capacity for throwing sand in the gears and stopping the wheels, as it were.

I have been asked to speak from the standpoint of personal experience as much as possible. I shall begin, therefore, with a personal experience which represented the biggest shock that I have ever had in my life.

In 1921 President MacVeagh of Kentucky University sent me a telegram saying that there was danger that the Kentucky legislature would pass an antievolution law. I had been brought up under religious influences, I had been associated in school work with the most outstanding of our theological seminaries of the country, and I knew what religion of the best type was, and the fact that such a thing was possible in an age when that type of thinking had disappeared for four hundred years, at least, had not existed since the time of the Inquisition, as I say, was the biggest shock that ever came to me in my life.

At one time I had the fortune to get fifteen thousand votes through my party, but it did not compare with the shocks that I got at that time.

When as Christ-like a man as Gilbert Murray makes the statement, which he made last year when asked what he thought regarding the Scopes trial, that his considered judgment of the Scopes trial was that it was the greatest setback to civilization in all history, it is time for you and me to begin to sit up and take notice and see where we are going.

I should not take so pessimistic a view as Gilbert Murray took, because from my point of view the Scopes trial, and all the publicity that has gone with it, has probably been one of the educative forces of our generation rather than the reverse. Why? Because it has set tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of people who have never done so before, to thinking about the foundations of their own religious conceptions.

Most of us act a good share of the time, all of us a part of the time, purely conventionally; we do the things which our neighbors around us do; we are Methodists or Baptists or Congregationalists or Republicans or Mohammedans because our fathers wore those badges and for no other reason. Stop and think about it a minute. Remember that I have included Mohammedans in that, because it is true. And yet, if there is anything in this world which is the basis of all character and the *sine qua non* of all progress, it is reflective morality as distinguished from conventional morality, if that latter can be called morality at all—I would rather call it something else.

I think that the Scopes trial, and all the newspaper publicity that has gone with it, has begun to set a large number of people who have never done so before to doing a little thinking on their own account. It has stimulated reflective morality, and if I can add a little bit to the spread of that habit in the United States I shall be more than justified for speaking upon a field in which I must speak merely as an individual, upon which I have no *ex cathedra* sanctions, upon which I have no real capacity to speak

except as all of us are obliged to work out some kind of scheme of things for our own use. If the type of thing which I work out is useful to somebody else, so much the better.

All that I have to say I said as carefully as I could in the group of lectures which I have just delivered at Yale, which are called the Terry lectures, and if in *extempore* I speak carelessly, check me up, if you wish to, by seeing what I said in print in those lectures. They are to be published by the Yale University Press.

As soon as you look at it from the standpoint of any knowledge of history, I think you will see at once, even if it is a Bible history, that this thing which we call religion is itself one of the finest examples which we have of the evolutionary process, because it is perfectly obvious that religion itself has come to its present status from the crudest sort of beginnings. You can see that in Bible history. In saying that, mark I am saying nothing which is in any way heretical; I am saying nothing which is not said and taught in every theological seminary of any importance in the United States, that is not said among every group of people who have any sort of familiarity with history or its interpretation. Indeed, one does not have to be an anthropologist or to have much knowledge of primitive man to see that the evolution of our religious conceptions has been something like this. I should like to call your attention to four stages, as I see it, in the evolution of religion.

Primitive man, just beginning to come into consciousness of himself, beginning to act a little bit reflectively instead of almost wholly instinctively as the lower animals do, finds himself surrounded on the one hand by his human enemies who kill and enslave him, to whom he has to give the best that he has, sometimes his daughter, sometimes his son, to make a cannibal feast; and on the other hand he finds himself surrounded by the forces of nature which seem to him as capricious and hostile, sometimes, as his human enemies.

He finds himself struck down with lightning, wasted with disease, dying of hunger. What does he do? Probably the only thing which anybody in that stage of development, with that stage of knowledge of the external things, can do—he personifies nature. He sees a god very much like his powerful enemy, too, in the thunder, ready to hurt him; he sees a Pan in the woods, a nymph in the stream, and all the things he does not understand in nature he attributes to the capricious acting of these beings whom he invents as the authors of these things which he does not understand.

When his need is very great, he tries to propitiate those beings, or that being, sometimes by sacrifices of the best that he has. Human sacrifice unquestionably has been practiced by most primitive peoples; it certainly was practiced all over the Mediterranean area. Iphigenia, daughter of Agamemnon, had to give her life to propitiate the gods when the Achæans pointed their ships toward Troy. You see it in Tyre and Sidon where the Phœnicians put their children into the fiery furnace to propitiate Moloch. And you see it in Palestine where Abraham, as the record says, was starting to offer up his son Isaac.

Somehow, somewhere, at some time, somebody arises who begins to think about this thing a little for himself. In the Bible story it was Abraham who began to ask himself whether God was just a man-like, vengeful brute who could be propitiated by the sacrifice on the part of a father of his only son, and he answered no, and then and there decided to break with the past.

The Bible says, "God spoke to Abraham." How did he speak? Through some Arab sheik who just then happened that way? If so, then it was the sheik to whom God spoke and not to Abraham. Through a voice that would have left a record on a phonograph concealed in the bushes? Who wants any such childish interpretation? Or was it through the still small voice of reflection that God spoke to Abraham? But anyhow, where did that idea come from

which got into Abraham's mind? Think of it. My answer is "I don't know." The greatest miracle there is, is the fact, first, that we are here. The being just begins to understand a little of nature, to exercise intelligence and to make choices.

Where do our ideas come from? I do not know. All that we know is that sometimes great new conceptions that lead us on to better things do spring up in the minds of men. I don't know any better way to state the fact than the one in which modern science can state the fact that then took place, and certainly with his animistic, anthropomorphic conceptions there was not any other way in which primitive man or man thousands of years ago could possibly have described that, because his whole thinking was based on those ideas. Think of that, too. You couldn't describe it any other way, no matter what happened. The idea got here. Nothing is important except that the idea did get here, that God was not a kind of being who could be propitiated by the sacrifice on the part of a father of his only son.

God spoke to Lycurgus, too, when he ordered human sacrifice stopped in Sparta only a few hundred years after Abraham had been stopped from his sacrifice in Palestine. Abraham and Lycurgus were very much alike in that neither of them was able to do more than to take a first faltering step away from the old conception. Abraham saw that God could not be a being who could be propitiated by the sacrifice on the part of a father of his son; but he thought still that He might be a being who would be propitiated by the sacrifice of a sheep or a goat instead of a human being, and a whole religion grew up over that idea of animal sacrifice to replace human sacrifice.

Abraham went farther than Lycurgus did, because when Lycurgus ordered human sacrifice stopped in Sparta, he replaced it by the flogging of young men and young women, still thinking that God was a being who could be propi-

tiated by the suffering of the young men and young women of Sparta.

Anyhow, with the abolition of human sacrifice, the first steps in the evolution of religion were passed. But before going on further I want to make a definition so that our thinking shall be quite clear. What do we mean by religion as I am using the word? Look at it historically, or look at it now, and you will get, I think, the same answer. There are two ideas that have been and are associated with all religions. One is the idea or conception, the definite conception, as to what is behind these multifarious phenomena of nature, lending unity and significance to them. What is behind all this that makes the whole thing of significance? In one word, conceptions about God. God is simply the word that we use to represent that group of those conceptions. Second, conceptions about duty, for obviously your conceptions of duty are intimately associated with your conceptions of God.

Notice how these conceptions of God and duty change as man increases in his intellectual outlook and in his better understanding of what this world in which he lives is like.

Now we are ready for the second stage in the evolution of religion. Millions of people have lived since the last age. They have practically all lived conventional lives; they have done what their neighbors were doing; they have brought the first-born of their sheep and cattle and oxen to sacrifice to their god or gods. They have tied mint and anise together and hung it.

And then suddenly another divine event occurs. A new conception of God springs up in the world. It comes in a certain way through Buddha, in a weak way through Mohammed, in a great big swelling tide through Jesus—a new conception of God, and with it a new conception of duty.

Jesus struck the most mortal blow that has ever been

struck at all childish literalisms and all those anthropomorphic conceptions which preceded him, in Jewry, too, when he said, "It hath been written." Where? In your Jewish Bible and in our Bible. "But I say unto you." And when he said, "God is not a man, God is a spirit." And when he said, "The kingdom of heaven is" (where?) "within you." And when he for the first time in the history of the Jews got away from the idea of a mere anthropomorphic God and pictured a being whose primary attribute was love, a benevolence which stretched out over all the world instead of being limited to those of his particular race, those who lived in Judæa.

The essence of his teaching is simply the gospel of a great benevolence dominating the universe, and obviously with that new conception came the new conception of duty, which was the duty of altruism among men. Through all the next fifteen hundred years that beautiful life and the teachings of Jesus and to a certain extent his conceptions also, became the basis of our whole Western religion.

Let's be perfectly clear, honest and definite. Let's not forget the backward steps which religion took during those fifteen hundred years, because it did become encrusted, encased, in superstition. Jesus had tried his best to keep his disciples away from the idea that his authority rested upon what he called a sign, any caprice in nature; but his followers had not risen to his height. And don't condemn them too much, because what I am trying to get before you is what seems to me to be the only viewpoint which can be used in any satisfactory way to interpret the past, namely, the historical viewpoint. Remember that that was an animistic age, an age in which you could not possibly describe an event such as is described in terms of possession by demons in any other way; literally there was no other way to describe it. They did not know anything about modern medicine, modern bacteriology; they did not and could not describe an event in any other way at that time.

It is no wonder that ideas that permeated all human society could not be eradicated in one year or in a thousand years.

Then, after fifteen hundred years, we begin to get the third step in the evolution of religion, a changing conception of God and duty. If the third step is to be associated with any particular name, I should associate it with the name of Galileo, because it was at about 1500 to 1600 that man began to get the notion which I shall represent by the scientific mode of approach to our study and understanding of this external world. Galileo was not, as Jesus was and as the great philosophers were, looking at the great big problem of trying to understand the whole. He got a little doubtful about the possibility of our understanding the whole at once, and so he took a part of nature and began to ask himself whether he understood fully just some little way in which nature works. For example, what is the relation between force or effort and the motion that is produced by it? That had been taught since Aristotle's time in a particular way. Just exactly as did Abraham, just exactly as did Jesus, Galileo began to question the conventional answer to see whether it fitted all experience or did not fit all experience. That is how he came to make that famous experiment in which he took up the two bodies that were alike in all respects, to the leaning tower of Pisa, and dropped them to see how fast they fell. I won't go into detail; you can look it up in your physics text. He found that the answer that had been given for two thousand years would not work any longer, and ideas that had permeated all society with respect to that thing had to be given up.

But Galileo was much more than that. He was not a destructive critic; he was a constructive thinker. Then he set to work to devote his whole life to the study of the problem of trying to replace the old erroneous conception by a new and more correct one, and out of it came what?

What we call Newton's second law of motion, represented by the formula, F is equal to MA—Force is equal to Mass times Acceleration.

The idea that got into human life at about that time has exercised (I speak knowing just what I say) a larger influence upon the destinies of the human race than any other single idea that has ever entered the human mind, and I say that not because our whole material civilization rests upon it, not because you can't design a single automobile or a single dynamo or a single steam engine without using it, not because if you take that prop out from modern civilization and modern thought you return at once to the conditions existing in ancient times in Greece and Rome, not primarily because of that, but because it changed the philosophic and the religious conceptions of mankind, and your conceptions and mine today are got from that, to a very large extent.

How did it change the philosophic and the religious conceptions of mankind? Philosophic because it was out of that that you had to get, that you got, the whole Copernican system of cosmogony as distinguished from the Ptolemaic system. And without F equal to MA you never could have evolved Newton's law of gravitation, which is the thing from which we get our proof of the correctness, or our best proof of the correctness, of the hypothesis of universal gravitation.

Man's place in the universe shifted at once. His little world had been all there was to it, the center of things.

What, from a philosophical standpoint, came from these new ideas? The possibility of the recurrence of this type of existence all over the universe, stimulating conceptions, vastly more stimulating than anything that had preceded philosophically.

Religiously what? You began at this time to get for the first time the idea of a nature which is orderly, of a nature which is capable of being known, of a God who works

through law. The idea: a God who no longer is a God of caprice and whim such as were all the gods of the ancient world, but a God who works through law and, further, a nature which has the capacities in itself of revealing laws, ordinances, which make it possible to utilize nature for the benefit, for the enrichment, of life.

And with this new conception comes a new conception, of course, of duty. If you want to see the difference, contrast the monasteries of the Middle Ages where well-meaning souls finding a bad world saw nothing whatever to do about it except to go off in a monastery and commune with their souls, contrast life to such monasteries with the effective, intelligent search for nature's laws for the sake of putting them to the use, the improvement, the progress of mankind, such as you find in the work of Kelvin, Pasteur, Maxwell, and men of that type—a new idea of God, of what this world is like, of what its foundations are, and of our duty, of our place in the scheme of things. Those began to come into human life about 1500. Jesus had got this idea of the great benevolence behind the universe. He felt it. Modern science has furnished evidence for almost exactly the same idea.

This brings me to the fourth stage of evolution, the fourth stage of our conception of God and duty. Through three hundred years of continuous application of the method of Galileo we began to read the geological history of the earth as revealed in the rocks, we began to read a continuous development of human organisms as developed through the study of anatomic structures; we began to read a continuous development of man as it is revealed in human history from the earliest times up to the present, an amazing development, a continual increase in control over environment, a continual movement from the lower up to what we call the higher, what we think are the better forms. The evolutionary idea is the most inspiring idea that has ever come into human life, unless possibly it was the one

that just preceded, namely, Jesus' conception of a great benevolence behind the universe.

Modern science is the most effective preacher you have in the world today, and look how close that preaching is to the preaching of Jesus. He preached altruism as the chief duty of man for the sake of man's salvation. Modern science preaches service for the sake of the world's progress. Where is the difference? One is simply the modern statement of the other.

The analogy is closer than that. Jesus preached altruism for the sake of the individual. "He that loseth his life shall save it." When the modern scientist says he does it for the satisfaction he gets out of it, for the fun there is in it, he is translating the words of Jesus into the most modern vernacular.

Of course, the conception has shifted somewhat, the emphasis has shifted, but what are we doing? Following the changes in man's conception of the world, that is his conception of God and of his place in the world, that is his duty in the scheme of things. Undoubtedly we have thrown the emphasis more in modern times, because of the impact of science upon religion, upon this progress of the race. You have introduced the most inspiring motive for altruistic effort that has ever been introduced—the idea of the place that we have a chance of occupying in this great scheme of all world progress.

What becomes of the individual in this process? Modern science has added nothing and it has subtracted nothing. Religion can treat that problem just as it has treated it in the past if it wishes to, or it may treat it in any other way that it wants. It is undoubtedly true that the keynote of modern religious effort is making this world a better place in which to live, getting rid of the sore spots and the cankers that infest our world, and that is an idea that has come into it through the growth due to modern science of this conception of progress, this evolutionary idea, this con-

ception of our place in the world and contributing to that progress.

Undoubtedly you have introduced a stimulus to altruistic effort, which is quite different from the old stimulus. That ability for us to fit into the scheme of things and to push on this upward movement is much more stimulating to some minds than singing hosannas forever around the throne. One is a much finer, broader conception, but you expect conceptions to broaden as we develop as a race, and they are doing it.

That is the fourth stage in the evolution of religion, as I see it, the fourth stage in the evolution of our conception of God and our conception of our place in the scheme of things, our conception of duty.

I recognize that in such an evolving, changing world there are, of course, crowds that hang behind, there are crowds that can't break away from the conditions of life of the past. You will expect that. On the other hand, there are other crowds that want to chuck the whole thing, they say it is all a mess of lies. Neither of those two crowds has any conception of what the evolutionary process means, what its signficance for the race is, or what the method is.

In a word, everybody is religious. We are incurably religious, as somebody has said. So far as this matter of religion is concerned, there are only two points of view that I can see. One is the dogmatic view—the point of view of assertiveness without knowledge. There are two groups who follow the dogmatic method. One calls itself the fundamentalist group; one calls itself the atheistic group. They are very much alike in their thinking, because both of them have a religion which is fixed, which is incapable of changing, which is incapable of progress. The only other attitude you can take is the attitude of the open mind, a religion which realizes that this world has changed, that religion has changed, that our conceptions have broadened,

and that they are going to broaden, for whoever keeps his mind open to new truths.

If there is anything that tends to make a man modest in the face of nature, reverent in his attitude toward God, it is a little familiarity first with the course of history (read your Bible if you want to get the ideas that I am presenting, because I am not presenting anything that is not there) and a little knowledge of the growth of modern science. Especially my own field of science, the field of physics, has within the last twenty years learned a good deal more modesty than it had before, because it has found that some of the conceptions of the nineteenth century that we thought were final are not final, that there are things outside the thoughts of the nineteenth century. And let you and me be careful to remember that there are things in religion outside our present conception, things that we have not reached nor begun to reach.

I want to make an analogy. You see, the whole thing is very much analogous to our conceptions of Santa Claus as we grow from childhood to youth. At the age of three or four Santa Claus, with his whiskers and his fifty-two-inch waistband, is the most real thing in the world. That is the anthropomorphic stage. By the age of six or seven he is measured up the chimney and around the fifty-two-inch waistband, and we see that it doesn't fit, and Santa Claus is a myth, the whole thing is a lie. By the age of thirteen or fourteen, if the child happens to have the good fortune to live in a family in which there are younger children just growing up, Santa Claus begins to come back, and by the age of thirty when he is hanging up the stockings of his own little ones, Santa Claus, the spirit of Christmas, is the most real thing in the world.

You must expect that in our racial development, which is full of recessions. You will have lots of people that are in the four-year-old stage of religious thinking; you will have others that are in the seven-year-old stage, repre-

sented by Mr. Mencken and his crew—"It's all a lie!"—irreverent. And you will have others that have got beyond that to the thirty-year-old stage.

The biggest need of the world is the education of the world, the religious world, up through the four-year-old, up through the seven-year-old, up to the thirty-year-old stage where everything is not a lie unless it has the precise hue and garb of the present with our modes of thought and our modes of speech.

If there is anything that is calculated to make one humble in the face of nature, open-minded, receptive of new truths, it is a little bit of familiarity with the last twenty years of physics. Two thousand years ago and more the prophet Micah said, "What doth the Lord require except to do justice, to love mercy," (those are your relations with your fellowman) "and to walk humbly with thy God." Modern science is learning to walk humbly with its God. It is teaching something and has something to teach to religion which often has not walked humbly with its God.

XII

THE FINDINGS OF MODERN PSYCHOLOGY AND THE POTENTIALITIES OF HUMAN LIFE

HARRISON S. ELLIOTT

Let us continue the discussion at the place where Dr. Millikan left it, and deal with a fifth factor in the development of religion, because religion has always had convictions regarding human personality and its possibilities. Up until recently these convictions were founded upon untested observation or mere speculation, but within the last fifty years, and particularly within the last twenty-five years, psychology as an experimental science has been developing. For the first time in history, human personality and individual and group conduct are being studied by scientific experimental methods. Psychology must be as humble as Dr. Millikan says that all science must be, and we must not expect too much of these findings. But even up to the present time the trends are significant for this discussion.

The presentations of this convention thus far have assumed that the ideals of Jesus can be put into practice by people individually and in groups; that colleges, industrial firms, and international relations can be, not in name only but in practice, Christian. But, on the other hand, there is widespread popular disbelief in the practicability of Jesus' ideals. Mr. Phillips brought to us last night in review some indications of the confidence of Jesus in the possibilities of human folks. But there is widespread skepticism about these potentialities, a skepticism in which Christians seem to share.

Any who have given themselves to the efforts for trans-

formation of individual life or of the social order have been met repeatedly with the argument that "This is impossible because of human nature." "Human nature being as it is," they say, "it is inevitable that we should have war; people were born fighters and they will always fight." "Human nature being what it is, there is no hope of substituting any cooperative system in industry and business for the competitive method; people were born for competition and it is only on the basis of competition that they will work at all." "Human nature being what it is, we are bound to have racial antagonisms; people seem naturally to have race feeling"—and so examples are multiplied. Is it not essential, therefore, that we cease arguing and speculating and face seriously the question whether or not we are deceiving ourselves concerning the potentiality of human beings?

Certainly, if psychological research should justify the practical pessimism regarding human possibilities, it would tend to confirm the widespread belief that Jesus was an impractical idealist. Such results would explain the failures of Christians to carry out in everyday life the ideals of Jesus, a failure recognized by several of the speakers, because these findings would show that human nature being what it is, Jesus' ideals are impossible of attainment by the great majority of people.

We have been considering our beliefs about God, as universal Father, but beliefs about God involve beliefs in regard to human beings and their possibilities. Certainly, if a great proportion of the human race has by original nature no real possibilities in this life, it is difficult to believe in God as a loving Father, or even in a friendly universe; nor is it possible to escape this dilemma by offering some hope for human beings in another world.

Without question, the scientific study of personality, as popularly reported and widely discussed, has seemed to give little ground for the optimism of Jesus. Following the popular interpretation of the results of the intelligence

tests, repeatedly it has been said, "What hope for a democratic form of government, when the average intelligence is that of a child of fourteen years." There is a fatalistic type of pessimism in the statement that, of every 10,000 individuals, a few will be feebleminded, a majority will be average, and not more than three or four per cent will be of superior ability. It seems that by the very native capacity with which individuals are born some are doomed to success and others to failure, some to be leaders and others followers.

This conclusion seems to be confirmed by the findings in regard to heredity. Recently a minister of a large church, evidently following Wiggam's "The Fruit of the Family Tree," made as the message of his morning sermon the belief that modern science has substituted for the theological doctrine of foreordination a more undeniable biological doctrine, since in the germ cell it is predetermined what the individual will be. This is but an example of a conviction that is widely held; namely, that we might just as well give up in regard to a great percentage of people because, with the capacities with which they have been born, there is practically no hope of their attaining any sort of real personality and independence and we can only treat them as the low-intelligence animals they seem to be. Somewhat this same attitude has been taken toward entire races. It has been assumed that they are born inferior and therefore predestined by God to an inferior relationship. Indeed, it must be admitted that the colleges, and even some of the secondary schools, take this attitude toward human personality. They make a selection from the entire population of those who they think are worthy of higher training, and they say it is their business to develop these, the foreordained leaders of the country.

People do differ both in character and achievement. Every person will admit this as the result of his commonsense observations, quite apart from any scientific findings.

The question is how far these differences are inborn and therefore inevitable, and how far they have come from differences in opportunity and training. Perhaps even more important than how one person compares with another is the attitude we may take toward undesirable characteristics, inefficiencies, and inadequacies in an individual. Might this person who has failed in school, failed at his job, failed to make good, have made a reasonable success in life? Here are two individuals: One is reliable, fine spirited, cooperative, friendly, lovable; he takes his place in life in an efficient manner. The other has a bad temper, is unreliable, uncooperative, and disliked; he is considered generally a failure. Might the first have been the second and the second the first; or were they born with different capacities and, therefore, these diverse characteristics were inevitable? Could they now be changed so that the person who has the undesirable characteristics could develop the desirable ones?

In popular parlance, we speak of a person being "naturally of a bad disposition" as if this was the way he was born when this is really his present disposition formed in his experience. We must distinguish between that which is inborn and the personality which is the product of training and experience. So the minister to whom reference was made earlier, who spoke on the biological doctrine of foreordination, read what he called a "biological will" in which were included, without discrimination, characteristics which had been developed in experience along with certain organic and physical assets or handicaps with which the individual was born. We cannot determine a person's original nature solely by what he is at the present time.

But having said this, all will agree that nothing can be developed in human personality for which there is not a basis in original nature. Training does not increase a person's native intelligence; it simply develops whatever intellectual capacity is there. Training does not give an individual native musical capacity; it develops the musical

possibility which was there in his original nature. Perhaps some people have a larger and more active thyroid or adrenal gland discharge into the blood, and this may make it easier for them to lose their tempers or to grow excited in an emergency. The native equipment with which an individual is endowed at birth does determine the *type* and the *limit* of his possibilities, and individuals do differ in this native equipment which is theirs by heredity.

A second point is important. Contrary to widespread popular belief, personality is not fixed at birth. It is there only in possibility.

This original equipment of human beings seems not to be what the psychologists used to talk about as instincts which developed as a plant from a seed. Individuals are not bound to manifest fighting, self-assertion, competition, mastery, display, and all the rest. There are differences in the quality of the raw material, but it is nevertheless raw material which is capable of being built into almost any sort of a personality structure.

Whether they call them S–R bonds, configurations, complexes, behavior patterns, or by some other name, the psychologists agree that the attitudes, skills, and habits—in short, the personality traits that make an individual liked or disliked, reliable or unreliable, a person of independence and initiative or a servile follower of others—have been developed in his experience. There are many more possibilities in any individual's native equipment than have ever been developed, and there are many characteristics he now has which would not have been present had he been born into a different kind of home, lived in a different community, gone to a different school, associated with different people, or been placed under more favorable or less favorable conditions. Even where two individuals are in the same family and seem to have been in a similar environment, we must realize that the conditions are not really the same.

This does not mean that the individual's native equipment is not an important factor. An individual with low vitality might yield and become subservient where an individual with more vitality would fight and become defiant. But, nevertheless, the one who is overcome by the environment had the possibility of being independent; and the one who fought and was defiant had the possibility of being a cooperator.

We will never really understand this until we think of a little baby starting out on the journey of life. He becomes hungry and wants to be fed; he is uncomfortable and wants to be taken care of; he has to adjust himself to this cold world into which he has come. As a matter of fact, he has a harder time adjusting himself to the home into which he was born, and getting along with his parents, and brothers, and sisters, than you had when you went to college and were compelled to learn how to live in these new relationships; and he often is as homesick as some of you were. He tried out from his repertoire those things which are more readily available, sometimes called instinctive. He finds in experience the ones which work; that is, the ones which get what is wanted or get him out of what is disliked. The ones which succeed persist; those which do not bring success are given up. If he finds that raising a row gets what he wants, and if this process continues throughout the years, you will have developed an individual who raises a row. If some other sort of conduct works, then that is what becomes developed. Human behavior is thus recognized as purposive, sometimes unconsciously so, in that it is developed in the experience of the individual in finding his way around in his environment and has served some use in the individual's adaptation.

Has it occurred to you that racial and national characteristics have developed in the same way? People have sometimes blamed members of the Jewish race for characteristics they did not like. In so far as these exist, is not the treat-

ment the Jews have received by Gentiles, by Christians indeed, during these last centuries, responsible; and have not these characteristics developed in the hard and successful fight which the Jews have had to make for a livelihood and, indeed, for life itself? The Chinese have had the reputation of being a peaceful people. They are now developing warlike qualities. Is this because their natures have changed? Not at all. But out of their experience with so-called Christian nations of the West, they are developing warlike qualities in response to and as protection against Western domination. Why is the mad rush for materialistic success so dominant a characteristic of the American that he is thought of in the rest of the world as the dollar chaser? Is there not a direct relation between the situation Americans have faced in a new country with unlimited resources and the development of this national characteristic? You will be able to multiply these examples. Racial and national characteristics have their bases in original nature, but those which are developed depend on the conditions the race or nation meets and the qualities which in experience seem to prove necessary to meet the situation.

An increasing number of difficulties which formerly were assigned to original nature are recognized as due to the sort of training and experience children have had. We have long recognized that to be born in a servant class in certain countries stamped one with the speech, the attitudes, and the manners of a servant. But we are now recognizing how far this goes. Children of different races get along together without race feeling until they learn race prejudice from their elders. Many of the sex difficulties of adolescents, and the wrecked homes of adults, are due to early unfortunate sex training. Born into a social system which assumes that a few are to be leaders and the others are to follow, God-given possibilities of the rank and file of people have little chance of development. Our entire educa-

tion leads to a premium on conformity and trains one to accept the dictates of the more able; and then, trained in home, school, and church, to be subservient acceptors of others' ideas, we criticize individuals because they are unwilling and unable to think for themselves and we severely reprove the more aggressive spirits, who break through their bondage, because of the crudity of their efforts. Individuals raised in sordid surroundings without the stimuli of beauty in music and art are criticized for their lack of appreciation. The characteristics which make one a useful and a desirable member of society are present in greater or lesser degree in possibility in the rank and file of people; but it is possible to develop characteristics just the opposite. A free, growing, healthy personality is an achievement dependent upon a proper kind of social experience.

Second fact, the kind of personality depends upon the kind of experience the individual has had.

Perhaps it is evident now why it is not possible to divorce the individual and the social gospel. Individuals express themselves in groups and have their characteristics shaped in a social medium. If homes, schools, and churches, if business firms, municipalities, and nations in their conduct are un-Christian, the children who grow up under these influences will develop un-Christian characteristics in order to get along with their elders and in order to make a success of life. Mr. Page truthfully said that if we use non-Christian methods we will grow non-Christians, no matter how worthy our aims. We cannot bring peace by war. If an individual protests alone, he does an heroic, but usually an ineffective, thing. But if a group, however small, commences to work definitely to create a little bit of the Christian social order in a home, in a college, in a factory, group conduct will change and individual characteristics will be modified. Such examples will be contagious. If we could stop our propaganda to win others to the Christian point of view and start practicing in groups,

small and large, the ideals of Jesus would indeed come; and then some day we would be able to produce a generation which would not know war, the members of which had developed the Christian characteristics because they had grown up in an environment in which these qualities were fundamental in the life of the group.

Psychologists, in the third place, are not willing to consider human personalities hopeless even when undesirable characteristics have already developed. They believe in the modifiability of human beings. The old fatalistic attitude was to say that the individual is what he is and you have to make the best of it. In the past, an industrial firm felt no responsibility for training the inefficient individuals but held them to come up to whatever standard was set, or get out. Criminal procedure held itself in no way responsible for helping individuals who had committed crimes to modify their behavior and become good citizens, but punished them because they had not been able to live up to that which society demanded. Miriam Van Water's "Youth in Conflict" reveals the opposite belief, as embodied in practice of present-day psychologists working in juvenile courts. If an individual has developed lying, stealing, or other anti-social habits, the psychologist in connection with the juvenile court assumes that there are reasons for this conduct, certainly in part beyond the control of the individual; and society as represented in this individual's home, school, or community, is held to account. What the individual needs is not punishment of the ordinary sort which still further sets his undesirable behavior. (Forty-six per cent of those who go to correction schools in New York State appear later in Sing Sing.) Crime is considered a symptom, and efforts are made to discover the causes and to adjust the contributing factors that the symptom may disappear and the individual become a useful member of society. How like the attitude of Jesus whose severe condemnation was for those who were the occasions of the stumbling of

others, but who sought in every way to help the one who had gone astray.

For a parent or teacher to call upon a specialist for advice in regard to tantrums and temper, severe crying and fear, defiance of authority, and other problems, and to have the doctor give advice and help in the same direct professional fashion that the child doctor gives help on diet and health problems still seems unusual. The causes are usually found in the home conditions, the attitudes of parents, the school environment; and these causal factors must be adjusted just as in health problems it is necessary to give attention to food, sanitary conditions, and other contributing causes of physical ill health.

A child is brought who is defiant at home, at school, everywhere. He refuses to cooperate in any way. He glories in the trouble he causes by his antisocial attitude. A year or two later he is cured; that is, he has not had his spirit broken and been made to knuckle down to authority, but he has become a cordial and cooperative member of society, and is using his energies positively instead of negatively.

For adults, also, problems of adjustment to one's job, troubles in getting along with others, marital difficulties, problems of temper, nervous breakdowns, and other types of conduct problems are now being treated in this scientific manner. It is a new day when a home problem which is about to cause divorce need not be taken to the law court but may be brought to a trained specialist who gives help in locating the sources of the difficulty and aid in making the adjustments necessary for a happy home.

Already, in these more scientific attempts for the modification of human conduct and character, the reverent psychologist and the open-minded minister are working together; and the religious worker is coming to see that everything he learns about human nature, and the conditions under which character is formed and transformed,

makes him by that much a more intelligent coworker with God.

The third fact, then, regarding human beings: undesirable characteristics may be changed for desirable ones, but only if the conditions are right.

The fourth point is this: Individuals have possibilities of growth and development far beyond their present attainment. The possibilities seem unlimited. At least, no individuals, with the possible exception of imbeciles, have been found who have reached the limit of their growth. No racial group has reached its limit. Note the tremendous progress of the Negro race during the past fifty years, when given a chance for development. Formerly, an adult was considered to have finished his period of education. But it is now recognized that these possibilities of growth continue up until senility, when the actual tissues of the body commence to break down; and this does not come about in some people until eighty-five or ninety years of age. The rapidly growing movement for adult education is the practical recognition of this psychological fact. Not all will follow the example of the woman of seventy who is reported in the newspapers as having enrolled as an undergraduate in one of the middle-western universities, but an increasing number of people will expect to continue their education until they die.

Formerly, those working in education gave up as hopeless the individuals of lower intelligence and waited patiently for the time when chronological age would permit them to drop out of school. But encouraging results have been secured with morons, below the level of normal intelligence, and backward children.

Children have previously been exposed to a sort of "survival of the fittest" educational experience in which only those who had the greatest possibilities could survive. We have already recognized in health that we do not need to allow people to die because they are not as rugged as others,

but that most individuals can develop reasonably strong and healthy bodies if given proper attention. Educators are coming to recognize that if education is adapted more largely to varying capacities and related more vitally to the life situations, possibilities can be developed which we have not recognized before. The great increase in experimental schools, and in research and experimental departments of education, is an indication of this search to adapt the content and method of education more nearly to the needs and capacities.

Especially important is a fifth group of potentialities. Human beings have within themselves the capacities for their own improvement. They possess, both individually and in social groups, the capacity to recognize fundamental needs or wants and to set them up definitely as goals to be worked for and attained in the future; and they are capable of learning out of their experience to criticize and improve both the goals they wish to attain and what they have done to reach them. This is the reason a human being can plan ahead for a vocation, or a home, or certain types of business success. This is the reason such great ends as better race relations and international good will can become the goals of endeavor. The fact that a human being can in the present draw upon the past, as he looks into the future, makes individual and social progress possible.

Further, human beings seem to be so made that all of their developed abilities rally toward the attainment of an end in which they really believe, and new and creative possibilities are released as well. Whether it be Kohler's monkeys seeking to find ways of getting fruit, or an Edison searching for a filament that will make an incandescent light; whether the individual is seeking to earn a fortune, to find the cure of cancer, or to discover means of eliminating racial strife, there is restlessness and earnest continuation of activity until the goal is reached, and resourcefulness, of which the individual was not aware, is

brought in to drive. You will see, therefore, why educators are putting so much stress on purpose.

This capacity operates also in ideals and standards. Everything we have rallies to help us carry out an ideal in which we really believe. There is strong emotional protest when we fail. To attain it brings the deepest satisfaction. This operates in uncritical fashion in the approval the individual feels when he does something in accordance with his early training, and in the emotional protest he has when he does something wrong according to his early standards. Many of you will recall your own struggles regarding amusements, and Sunday observance, and other practices. But our nature seems to be just as insistent in regard to standards and purposes which we have not inherited socially and uncritically from our parents but which we have made our own by an adequate thinking-feeling process. This is what we might call an enlightened conscience, rather than the uncritical conscience which follows simply the standards of the family or group to which we belong. Perhaps this discussion will give added appreciation of Jesus' emphasis on what an individual purposes in his heart. Certainly, once Christians come to believe in the ideals of Jesus and really desire to make them the goal of practical endeavor, human nature has both the capacities for making these the dynamic ends of effort and the resourcefulness to attain these goals.

Five things then psychology has to say regarding the potentialities of human life:

First, the limit and range of what may be developed in any individual is inborn in him. Individuals differ in this native equipment.

Second, original nature does not predetermine personality. That which is developed depends upon experience, and the same original nature with a different type of environment will develop entirely different characteristics.

Third, human characteristics are modifiable. Persons of

undesirable characteristics can change to people of better characteristics.

Fourth, the capacity for growth is very large, seemingly unlimited. The effort of education is to bring out latent possibilities in people and make continued growth possible.

Fifth, human beings have within themselves the capacities which make for their own improvement and development and the basis for the dynamic which leads them on to the realization of their purposes.

It will be seen, therefore, that the psychologist really shares the confidence of Jesus regarding ordinary folks. He has no blind belief that everything will turn out all right no matter what happens. But just as Jesus, though recognizing differences (note the parable of the talents), had confidence in the unrealized possibilities of the blind beggar as well as of the rich young ruler, so the psychologist sees in all individuals and groupings potentialities far beyond those that have been attained and possibilities worth developing. Indeed the psychologist who is seeking to make available resources for the tranformation of human life has a right to feel himself as belonging to the direct fellowship of Jesus.

Perhaps it is because we have not recognized nor dared to use the divine potentialities in ourselves and in others that we make so little progress. Some of us, like little children who look to their parents to do everything for them, have assumed that God wants us to be infants in relation to Himself.

It is only as children are encouraged to take responsibility that they realize how little others can do for them and how much they can do for themselves; but in the process they come to understand how much parents, teachers, friends can really help them in helping themselves. Do we not all at first feel that we wish others to take responsibility and tell us what to do? Some came to this Convention expecting it to give a direct answer to their problems. But per-

haps they already realize that others cannot answer their questions satisfactorily. There are probably many here who are making no progress on religious problems because they have not enough confidence in themselves and in others, and in the universe of which they are a part; in other words, not enough confidence in the immanent God, to take the first steps on any worthwhile problem or task. Perhaps they need to quit speculating on life and religion and really commence to assume an adult's responsibility. Religion can easily become an escape from life rather than an aid to meeting it courageously. College can be the same. Some are asking religion to guarantee them a way out before they have even tried. It will not do this; but Jesus did say: "If you have faith as a grain of mustard seed you can say to this mountain, be ye removed and be ye cast into the sea, and nothing is impossible to him that believeth." If someone will only help you to find some practical worthwhile endeavor, in which you really believe, but which seems beyond your power of attainment, and will lead you to undertake it wholeheartedly, you will find both yourselves and God in the process; and your questions one by one will be answered if you have faith to take each new step. True confidence, which is faith, grows by practice. Strength comes through endeavor. God is found as individuals find themselves in the great cooperative enterprises for human progress; in comradeships, in great endeavors of life, in home, school and community, in race relations, political affairs, and international endeavor. In one sense, confidence in one's self and in others is the deepest expression of confidence in God. At any rate, it is in our fellowship with others in such enterprises that our sense of God and our fellowship with Him grow.

Some seem to be fearful lest psychology will make a genuine religious faith impossible. But the opposite seems to have been the record of the adoption of a scientific method in other areas of life. Each new scientific advance

has been feared, and indeed opposed, on the ground that it destroyed faith and denied God. Think of astronomy, medicine, evolution, historical method in relation to the Bible. Each advance, it is true, has necessitated a rethinking of the meaning of religion, but the net result has been to rid religion of magical elements and to give the basis for a more intelligent faith. The science of psychology, dealing as it does with human personality, of course necessitates a rethinking of religion; but those who have come even to tentative conclusions on the meaning of a religious faith, which takes into account what we are coming to know of the laws of God in human personality and in social relationships, testify that, while their conception of God has been changed, it has been enriched; and they face life with a greater confidence because their religious faith has become a more intelligent factor in life.

No scientist claims to create the resources for human life and endeavor. He discovers them and finds the conditions necessary for their release. As the reverent scientist discovers in the physical universe around him possibilities beyond his understanding, he bows reverently in the presence of these before unrealized forces of nature, recognizing that he is in the presence of God Himself. As he discovers methods for the cure of human ills, he recognizes that he is but the instrument for the use of resources resident in the universe and in the human organism. The physician furnishes the conditions, but God works the cure. And as he thus learns more of these infinite resources, he becomes a more intelligent coworker with God and secures new revelations of the Divine.

So the psychologist, as he comes to realize the unlimited possibilities of human folks and the infinite resources resident within them, feels that he is learning more of God as he comes to know the divine laws in human personality and that he is helping to reveal to individuals the immanent resources of God. Nor is this asking individuals to lift

themselves by their own boot-straps or suggesting to them a human God. What can give one more confidence in the immanence of God than to find these infinite resources resident within the universe? And what can give one more confidence in a God of love, immanent in human life, than to discover these infinite potentialities resident in human beings?

But there is one important difference between the religion of a scientific and a prescientific world. In a prescientific age, these resources of a universe were thought to be available for the mere asking. God could be appealed to and he would respond directly, like a fond father. So people asked God for rain for their crops, for money they needed, for success in a business deal, for the immediate cure of disease, for the elimination of a bad temper, for success in examinations, and expected God to intervene directly in answering their prayers. Most individuals now recognize that this assumes a lucky-chance chaotic type of universe with a God of whims, and are ready to admit that these infinite resources in the physical universe are not available for the mere request, but only as we, as human beings, genuinely ask by doing our part in discovering and meeting the conditions. But is it not true that in the realm of human personality most of us assume a prescientific God who can be appealed to directly for the miraculous transformation of human character? Psychology is the recognition that within the realm of human personality we must change from a prescientific to a scientific attitude. We cannot assume here that God will intervene directly or that he will perform a miracle to make up for our neglected effort. We used to think that when a man started the Christian life, his whole character was instantaneously transformed. We now recognize that Christian character is an attainment, secured by earnest and persistent practice. There are some who have attained it in their more personal relations with their families and their friends, who

have not yet even tried to reach it in business, in politics, and in racial affairs. They are Christians only in those areas in which they have persistently sought to be Christians. There are infinite possibilities of transformation and development within human personalities; but the true Christian will not expect these changes to take place by the easy method of the direct intervention of God in answer to his request, but only as he truly prays and becomes a real coworker with God in searching to discover the conditions for such transformation, and in working earnestly to bring about the results. God is then not the wonder worker, but the real and immanent source of our life, with whom we have growing fellowship as we come to know more fully the evidences of Himself in the universe around us and in human personalities.

One reason many are having difficulties with prayer, church worship, and other religious practices must now be evident. These are still, in so many cases, expressed in the prescientific terms of a universe in which a God, acting without reference to law, may be appealed to directly to respond to our requests. They do not represent an expression of our deepest beliefs, for all the rest of our life assumes a scientific universe in which results are possible when conditions are discovered and met. What is needed is a conception of God, a type and content of prayer, and an expression of worship that are true to one's scientific knowledge about human personality and about the physical universe and, therefore, true to his most fundamental beliefs about God. When one has fellowship with a God who personalizes all his deepest confidences in himself, in others, and in the universe itself, his religious faith becomes the very center of life.

XIII

THE CROSS

G. A. Studdert Kennedy

Make what is true more true to me,
Let fuller light appear;
All that is evil take from me,
All that is doubtful clear.

Let no false confidence betray,
Nor foolish fears mislead,
But in the true and narrow way,
Be Thou my Guide indeed.

Do more for me than I may know,
My will from self set free,
Thy perfect gift of love bestow,
That I Thy child may be.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord.

The deepest-seated and most powerful passion of every living thing from the unicellular amoeba to man is the passion to preserve and perpetuate its own existence. The very essence of life is the desire of life. If life outlives the desire of life, then life is but living death, its strength is but labor and sorrow, so soon passeth it away, and it is gone.

Those of you who go about the world with your eyes open and your hearts quick will meet in the course of your travels many in whom life has outlived the desire of life, who have nothing left to live for. There is no more piteous sight in all the world.

I am fully aware that the most modern school of psychology does not like one to talk in terms of the psychology of instincts and passions, maintaining that there are no

sets that can be listed as inevitable instincts, because the responses are capable of such an immense amount of varied conditioning from the time of youth. But there are certain phases of that psychology which, in my opinion, will have to be modified when the science is a little older and perhaps a little less presumptuous.

For my part I cannot see the difference between a prenatally conditioned response and an instinct. Furthermore, I imagine psychologists will find that there still are certain basic psycho-physical propensities of men which, however they may be conditioned, will remain essentially themselves. I know that John B. Watson, although he doesn't like to have a fighting instinct, preserves a vital disposition to rage when emotions are inhibited, and it seems to me as I read that it is a distinction without a very visible difference. At any rate, it is perfectly certain that over the whole field of humanity there has been a fighting instinct, which I believe is part of the domination of the desire for self-preservation, not always guided by intelligence.

The passion of self-preservation, like all the other passions, is much more powerful in man than it is in any other living creature. A century or so of civilization has led to the peculiar or extraordinary doctrine that men are mild animals. That is at once a slander on the animals and a slander on men. All the passions found in animals are found in men, and in a much fiercer and more powerful form. Animals fight with teeth and claws. Man would be ashamed of such simple weapons. When he fights it is with bombs from above and mines from beneath and every damnable engine of destruction that his wits can devise. Man wars under modern conditions without mercy against women and children and against the strong and the weak; for once he carries his abominations into the air, there is no choice between combatant and non-combatant, between sexes, and between children and soldiers in the field.

Animals lust, but they are mild in their lust. They have

for the most part their mating season and for the rest lead fairly continent lives. Men and women are the most powerfully sexed creatures in the world; they observe no mating season. That is why for years there have been every year processions of prostitutes who destroy their bodies and damn their souls to minister to the lusts of men.

Animals eat, and when their hunger is assuaged they cease to eat. Men eat their bodies into disease and death trying to find infinite joy in the pleasures of the table. Animals drink, and when their thirst is assuaged they cease to drink. Men drink themselves blind or maudlin drunk and behave like beasts. Animals show off in a mild and gentle kind of way. The peacock spreads his tail in the sun and says, "What a fine fellow I am!" The fantail pigeon bows with lovely gestures to his mate. We admire the instinct of showing off or self-display that we find in the animals. But in man this instinct has always been, throughout history, a cruel, merciless, powerful urge, driving men on to extravagances of cruelty. It has led some men to live in marble palaces while they kept their brothers living in sordid pigsties. It has led some men to dress or half-undress their women in absurd and expensive clothes while their sisters walked about in rags and tatters. And the passion that lies behind the vulgar, ugly, insensate luxury that marks American life, English life, and European life has marked the history of man down the ages and is the blind passion of showing off. The vast and superexpensive dress, the squandering on show, is nothing but the monkeydom, the animalism of showing off. It is a blind, brutal passion, as ugly, as nasty as sexual lust, and it has done just as much damage in the world.

All these passions exercise enormous power in the lives of men. That they can be rightly conditioned, if you can arouse the desire to rightly condition them (and that is a big "if"), I do not for one moment doubt. That they can be submitted to the discipline and rule of our Lord and

Saviour, if you can arouse them to the desire of being submitted, I have no doubt. But you first have to arouse the desire. John Watson, I have no doubt, will be a valuable aid when we can get mothers to want their children to be conditioned as he wants them to be, but until then I am afraid he won't be of much use. You have to get people to desire a higher life before you can get them to submit themselves and their children to the discipline of attaining it.

Those passions in men which are more powerful than in animals make men, by the very passion that is in them, capable of a great change under the providence and guiding of that mind and power that works behind the universe.

Towering above all the passions and knitting them together complexly around itself, there is forever the passion of self-preservation. But that passion undergoes a change as it proceeds through life. You see the beginning of that change when you see a tigress, with bleeding breast and eyes fast dimming with death, fighting on still when she has nothing left to keep her fighting but the instinctive will to do so, still under the sway of the great passion of self-preservation, and fighting not only for herself, but for two little bundles of fur in a thicket behind her, fighting for her cubs. She fights for her life itself and for her life which has been extended and has manifested itself in those little cubs. That wider and wider life to seek which man is driven by the very power of vitality of self-preservation that beats in him is extended *ad infinitum* in man, so that a man loves to love and to be willing to die for his family, his clan, his country, or his country's honor. He will rise to such a height that he will turn on the thing that he loves most dearly, turn on his own land, on his own kindred, and his brethren of the flesh, and will cut himself off from them and suffer the agony of separation because for him his country's honor has become life itself, and he would rather die than see her degraded. It still is life that he is fight-

ing for, but life has grown larger. It is still that same overmastering and tremendous passion for life, more life, only life has grown wider and wider.

Those of you who have seen or read Bernard Shaw's great masterpiece "Saint Joan" will remember a scene which is among the greatest tragic scenes on the modern stage. Saint Joan, believing that her voices could not have led her to death, recants her faith; then the judges tell her that they are going to lock her up for life in a dungeon, away from the sunlight, because, they say, they are afraid of hurting her soul. The moment she replies to that is one of the most glorious things in modern drama.

The judges say to her: "We are going to lock you up in a dungeon."

Saint Joan says: "Light your fire! Do you think I dread it as much as the life of a rat in a hole? My voices were right."

They all cry out, "Joan, Joan, don't!"

She turns on them and says, "Yes, my voices were right, they told me you were fools and that I wasn't to listen to your fine words nor trust your charity. You promised me my life, but you lied. Do you think that life is nothing but not being stone dead? It is not the bread and water I fear. I can live on bread. And when have I asked for more? It is no hardship to drink water if the water is clean. Bread has no sorrow for me, and water no affliction. But to shut me out from the light of the sky and the sight of the fields and the flowers, to chain my feet so that I can never climb again or ride with the soldiers, to make me breathe foul, damp darkness and keep me from everything that brings me back to the love of my God, when your wickedness and foolishness tempt me to hate Him—all this is worse than the furnace in the Bible that was heated seven times. I could do without my war horse, I could drag about in a skirt, I could let the banners and the trumpets and the knights and the soldiers pass me and leave me

behind as they leave the other women, if only I could still hear the wind in the trees and the larks in the sunshine and the young lambs crying through the healthy frost, and the blessed, blessed church bells sending angel voices floating to me on the wing. But without these things I cannot live, and by your wanting to take them away from me or from any human creature, I know that your counsel is of the devil and that mine is of God."

There is the passion for life preservation, but the life she sought to preserve got all bound up with the love of life and the love of God; if she is to be shut away from God and the lovely things of life, she would rather die. That is what can happen. Men can live for beauty and live for goodness and live for truth until life without beauty and life without goodness and life without truth isn't worth living, isn't worth bothering about; death would be better. It is still the passion for self-preservation, but life has grown larger and larger. It is those men who live for beauty, goodness, and truth that have made science and art and society. There would have been no science if it had not been for those who had a passion for truth, to whom truth was life itself. You think of a scientist as a rather dry, matter-of-fact person who has no imagination and no feelings. But do you suppose any man ever underwent the discipline, the training, and the years of hard, patient figuring and work that are necessary to make a man a great scientist, without a passion to drive him on? Your head won't work in a vacuum; you have to have something to drive it. All the great scientists have been men who had a passion for truth. As the biographer of Einstein says, "The attitude that fits him for his work is that of a devout and devoted lover. He adores nature and he is ever and always seeking behind her to find the glory that is in her. He is a great musician as well as a great mathematician. There is a passion in his heart for truth." And there would have been no art if it had not been for those who had

a passion for beauty, to whom beauty was life. You do not realize how much the artists have taught you to see, how dull your eyes would have been, how you would have missed the lovely things in God's world around you if it had not been for those who had a positive passion for beauty.

There would have been no society, no goodness, but for those who had a passion for justice and piety and mercy and right, those to whom it was life, those who would rather die than live uncomplaining and unrebellious in an unjust and cruel world. You think that the civilization you have attained is necessarily permanent, that having arrived here you must stop here. You can go right back, way back to the very depths, if there is not a sufficient number of people in the country that have a passion for justice and righteousness and tenderness to the weak and for the building of a new nation. It is the passion for those things that lies behind it all. They have created science, art, and society. In a sense it is true to say that they have created God. There would have been no God for man if it had not been for those to whom God was life, those who passionately desired God. When you drive me to the last position of my stand, I believe in God because I want Him, because life in a world that has no purpose, no meaning, and no plan is intolerable to me; if this hasn't a meaning, I am going to make it have one. I cannot live without God. I believe in God because I want Him.

"Oh!" the cynic says, "that quite explains it. You make God out of your own desire."

Yes. And why do I have these desires? Why am I the only creature who has this strange longing to make the world a better place? Why am I the only being, my kind the only kind that loves beauty and goodness and truth? Who put that longing there? The only reply that I can make is that I love God because he made me for Himself and my heart is restless until it rests at last in Him.

Some say that every thought is invalid where the wish is father to the thought. Why, the fools, there isn't a thought in the world that the wish isn't father to, not a single one! It is high desire that lies behind the very act of things. I couldn't have thought these things unless there were at the heart of the universe something that makes me think, because I am grown out of the universe, because it is in my heart and that is the substance of my faith. The whole question is, "Where do we get this passion to make God?"

Then you say, "I have no passion for God, no desire for beauty or goodness or truth or justice, and I live a very respectable life." I have no doubt you do, my dear. You have the soul of a flea. You live by sucking the blood of people more vital than yourself. But if everybody was as white livered and as emasculate and as half-baked as you, the whole world would go to bits. You are just a passenger in the ship. You are being carried by the people that do care, and if they cease to care, you will jolly well find out what becomes of your comfortable, easy, respectable life. You will get into some dirty hell like that in Europe where Christ has been forgotten and justice exists only in dreams. Can't you realize that it is the men who have the passionate desire for the better world that are upholding the world even at its present stage, and they alone can be the cause of its progressing one step farther? Do you realize that the whole of civilization hovers forever on the brink of a ghastly abyss of barbarism into which it may totter any moment if there is not sufficient passion for the righteous thing beating in the hearts of the people of every nation?

That is the reason that faith is the vital climax of the instinct of self-preservation. It is the passion of self-preservation when life has reached its highest. This passion for self-preservation can attach itself to anything. No matter to what it attaches itself, it tends to build up a dramatic unity of the world around it which gives

meaning to the universe. Faith, that is the passion for self-preservation, always seeks to find a meaning in the universe; it always builds the universe into a dramatic unity which expresses the vital values men want to find in it. I don't know whether that is plain. This instinct for getting at the heart of life always is seeking to create unities; the mind of man driven by the passion of self-preservation is ceaselessly creative, it is always creating unities. That is what the philosopher is doing—creating unities. That is what the physicist is doing; he is creating unities around which he can group certain sets of facts and so carry them in his head and envisage what they mean. That is what the chemist is doing, that is what the botanist is doing. They are all creating unities, for to do so is instinctive. All of those unities, however, are abstract, they do not reveal personal values, they cannot reveal beauty or truth or goodness, they cannot be things to live for; but this passion for self-preservation, which when it reaches its highest point is faith, is always creating a dramatic unity out of life, which gives its meaning to life because only a dramatic unity can express personal values.

That is why the revelation of God must be a drama. People are always talking about the wickedness of being anthropomorphic. We heard a tremendous lot about that this morning, as if you were all very wicked because you were anthropomorphic, in other words, you were very wicked if you thought about the world in terms of personality. The truth is that you are much more likely to be wicked if you think of it in any terms that are left. There is nothing peculiarly true about making the world a thing of abstractions and principles and laws, because you contain principles and you contain laws, but you are more than laws, you are a person. As personality is the highest category of human thought, to think out the world in terms of personality is always a nearer approach to truth than to think it out in terms of abstraction. When you are being

lectured by scientists, you have to remember that you are being lectured by people who deal in abstractions, not in the concrete, and nothing has a chance of being true that doesn't think out things in the terms of personality. That is what relativity and humanism in philosophy are going to bring us to in the end. You have to be to a certain extent anthropomorphic because you are theomorphic and because God made you in His image and because you are a person. And there is no kind of unity which will express personal values except a drama. There is a unity in a drama, and life is to be conceived of as a vast drama in which personalities are the heroes and heroines and their lives fit into a unity under the guiding hand of the mind that directs the drama.

We instinctively know that, and when we seek our life's faith, we always build a drama. You do not understand communism in Europe until you grasp the fact that it is not a system of economics but of faith, a fanatical religion, the devotees of which put us Christians to shame by the earnestness and enthusiasm of their belief.

As an economic system Marxianism has been so riddled with criticism over and over again that it hasn't a leg to stand on. But that makes no difference to communists. You may riddle it fifty times again and they will believe it as passionately as ever, because it is the drama which gives to them the meaning of life. When they close their eyes, they see two great armies marching to battle; their army is the army of the dirty and the work hardened and the downtrodden, and the other army is the army of the fat and the prosperous and the sleek; life is a drama of the battle between the two, in terms of which everything is interpreted and every person is judged. I have seen an act of Shakespeare's Hamlet in terms of that drama. It is worked into everything. If I go and speak to the communists and I wear spats, that means I am in the other army. I may be wearing them to hide a hole in my socks. If I wear a white

collar and a dark coat, I am bourgeois. If I am educated and don't drop my "h's," I am bourgeois. They dramatize everything I say into that and they read everything into it. They read all history in the light of that combat and see nothing but that wherever they go.

Nationalism is dangerous only when it becomes a faith. Men will never fight until nationalism is raised to a religious level and until it has become a passion with them and appears to be a drama. What made men spring from their desks and go out and fight in Germany and France? They thought to themselves, "By George! I have found out now what life means. I know what it is for. I know what I was born for now. I have my job! Life means a battle between Britain and her foes. Life means a battle between America and her enemy! I know what I have to do now! I have to line up on my own side and play to the death." It was a faith, a drama into which they put their whole beings and which gave to them the meaning of life. That is what religion means.

What most of you intend to do is to act private dramas in which you are the hero or the heroine, the charming lady or the big strong man. Of course, you don't tell anybody about it, but lots of you who would despise the nature of religion and are ashamed to worship God are worshipping your insignificant selves and constructing a private little drama in which you find the meaning of life. And you dare not tell anybody because you would be told the truth —that you are a fool.

Lots of people who despise worshipping Jesus Christ are worshipping something much less respectable; people who despise his drama are inventing little dramas of their own and are thinking to find the meaning of life in them.

That is the terrible thing about politics. Politics easily becomes religion. I am afraid of the time when pacifism will become the only religion, because, as it tends to make a drama of life, it will draw the world into a battle between

pacifists and anti-pacifists. That is why some pacifists are such very militant men. You often find that the most pugnacious member of a conference is a pacifist, and he is very anxious to dare the whole house. Pacifism as a great religion is likely to be self-assertive. For centuries heaven has been armed. That is what happens in the church when your religion is that of being a Protestant and not being a Catholic and your main duty is to hate Catholics and not to wear vestments, and the same when your religion is to be a Catholic and to hate Protestants. That is not the religion of Jesus Christ; it is worshipping false things.

The Christian faith says that the passionate faith that is in man will find a goal; it will find a goal either in one of the little private dramas or a goal in some bigger one. It is never safe until it is centered in the sublime and lovely drama of the life of Jesus of Nazareth. You find in the drama of his life, which began in Bethlehem and ended in the figure ascending into heaven, the expression of the meaning of the universe.

When I say that I love Jesus Christ, I don't mean that I love that character that walked by the seas of Galilee years and years ago, I mean that I love him not after the flesh but after the spirit; I love him as the revelation of what the world means, and in the drama of his life I find the meaning of the cosmos, because the word became flesh—the word, that is the meaning of life, became flesh and dwelt among us, and men beheld his glory, that is, his inner character, full of grace and truth. The life of Jesus is the drama that reveals in terms of human personality the meaning of the whole universe. In him all things consist.

What the Christian faith has done is to take out of that life four great pictures and hold them up before you and say, "In these four pictures you can see the meaning of life." The first picture, a baby on its mother's knee, says that life means new birth. Christ was born once to assure us that Christ is forever being born. That was an act in

time revealing the nature of eternity. He was born once in Bethlehem that he might proclaim the fact that he is forever being born and reborn, and that the meaning of life is a continual rebirth.

Look back over the past and see how exactly that fits the tale you were told this morning of a life that is reborn, reborn, reborn, into higher and higher and higher stages, getting more and more perfect until it reaches its climax in the God-life of Christ. Everywhere Christ is being born anew. In this conference, please God, he is being born anew. Whenever I have looked down on you lovely people sitting here and have thought of all that you are capable of, I have prayed in my heart that Christ was being reborn in America, a new Christ, a brighter Christ; I have prayed that a Christ more like the essence of the Christ that walked by the seas of Galilee is being reborn among you. Ours is a religion that believes in rebirth and rebirth and rebirth until it ascends to the throne of God.

Rebirth alone, however, would not describe the facts of life, it would not do justice to the drama of life. You have to pass on from Bethlehem to Calvary, and you have to look upon that figure which embodies the life, which incarnates it and reveals it, you have to look upon that figure, battered, broken, and bleeding, hung up between the earth and sky, suffering torture, before you see what the drama of life means. You have not only to be born again with Christ; you have to be crucified with him.

Christ was crucified once to reveal to us that in the time process he is forever being crucified. The Cross is not past but present. Ever and always I can see set up above this world of ours a huge and towering cross with great arms stretched out, and on it my God still hangs and calls to all brave men to come out and share his sorrow and help to save the world.

I am a very prosaic kind of person, and I have never had anything in the nature of a vision in my life. I have

never had any of these sudden revelations. I have a strong sense of the presence of God, but I have only once in my life experienced something that I couldn't account for in the ordinary way of prayer. I want to tell you that tale because it brings out exactly what I mean.

On June 7, 1917, I went into battle, a sorely troubled and bewildered man. It fell to my lot to take a message up to the line through a German barrage. I didn't know that when I set out or I might never have set out. On my way up I was running through a wood, mad with fright, absolutely crazy, but, thank God, still running the right road, and as I ran I tripped over something lying on the ground. I stopped and looked, which is the odd part of it; that is not a time when one ought to stop and look. I stopped and looked, and I must have stood for some considerable time. On the ground at my feet was a little German boy, lying huddled up as a baby lies, with a big hole in his stomach and a great hole in his head out of which his brains were coming.

I remember quite distinctly that first of all I said as I looked down, "You poor little devil! How did you come into this? Who brought you here?"

It seemed to me as though the boy wasn't there any longer, that in his place there was Jesus of Nazareth on his Cross. He seemed to be objectively there, and he said, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these my children ye have done it unto me." And then he disappeared.

I went on. That is true, and I was as happy as could be until the end of that battle, and in my heart I have been happy ever since, because now I know what the evil in the world means. It means Christ is being crucified but not killed, because he won't die; you can't kill him, he will rise again, he will *always* rise again.

I never thought of that afterwards without thinking of it as the Crucifixion and the Resurrection behind it. I have

never thought of Europe since as anything else but a Crucifix with a Resurrection behind it. I never think of the dirty slums as anything else but a Crucifix with a Resurrection behind it. I believe that Christ will always rise from the dead, and that this life of his is always being crucified. It has to be crucified in you and crucified in me. That is the great basic difference between the Christian religion and every other. It shows us suffering in the face of God, and it calls you and me not to fight for God, but to suffer for Him. "I call my people not to fight but to suffer for the Kingdom of God."

You cannot get the peace of the world until men will face the suffering that is necessary to bring it about. Suffering very largely means work. If you have to learn to live with people altogether different from yourselves, people whose ways of looking at things are different, whose traditions are different, whose bringing-up is different, you have to face continual strain. It is easy talking to people like yourselves; that is why people go into cliques and sects and little groups in corners, because you can rest so much better with such people, it is as easy as eating pie. But if you have to deal with a person whose ways of life are different from yours, whose thoughts are quite different, whose way of looking at things is quite different, then it is not so easy.

As everybody who has worked with that kind of thing knows, the test of it is not when you are kind to a foreign student on your own campus; he has become partially Americanized, he can talk your language, he doesn't talk and use words that make the dictionary look as if it were going to burst, from your point of view, and he hasn't ways that you are not used to. When you go over and get among people who live according to their own ways and you have to go through all the trial and striving that will make you understand them and suffer with them, you begin to feel the strain. It is just the same with the rich and the

poor; they don't mix. Why don't they mix? Because it is a strain for both. They don't like it. They don't like trying to understand one another. They don't like looking at the unpleasant things. One side looks with envy at the other because it has an inferiority complex, and the other side looks with disgust because it has a superiority complex. They won't undergo the suffering of love.

It is the same with some of you young people who have outgrown, in a way, your parents. It may be pure impertinence on your part. It may be a real thing. It may be that you are reaching out toward the higher life and your dear mother and your dear father do not understand it, and they want you to go to Europe and you are being mad and are coming to Milwaukee; they want you to go and have a nice house party somewhere, and you say, "I am going to find God in Milwaukee." Your poor dear old father scratches the back of his old gray head and wonders what in the world is happening to his dear daughter and his dear son, and wishes these student conferences had never been born. When you go home you will have to suffer because of your own dad, and he will have to suffer because of you. It he loves you, as I suppose he does, and he doesn't understand you and what you are doing, and he is a good man, there will be pain in his old heart about this. Jesus said when he came, "I come not to bring peace, but a sword, because the daughter will rise up against her mother and the son against the father and they will betray one another. Yet if you love father or mother more than me, you are not worthy of me." In other words, you must go on with it, my dear. If you have seen the vision and you have a job to do and you know you have to follow the Christ, you have to go on and suffer, but never fight. Therein lies the difference.

If you are going to follow the Christ in other people, their sins have to become your sins, you have to suffer for them. Men fight when they can't bear the strain of thinking and

planning and loving any longer. That is what we have done with criminals in the past; we have said that this man was a murderer, as we were told this morning, or a thief, and therefore we were going to put him in a prison and save ourselves the trouble of finding out what was really the matter with him. If you are going to be a Christian you have to find out what is the matter with him and labor and work and struggle to cure him.

The Cross is not something sentimental that you bear in a tragic sort of way. It means very often just hard work, pulling up your socks, as we say at home, and getting down to a job of work and thinking and living and trying to bear with other people, and getting into the spirit and thinking of God, suffering by fine, solid, earnest working and suffering for mankind.

If you bore it to the full, all it could be borne, you would go mad. If you really went out into this world and came to know what bitterness and sorrow and treachery and evil and dirt there is in it and you did what Jesus did, and took it all to yourself, and you didn't become a Pharisee and despise people, and you didn't become a cynic, you would go mad. The cynic shakes his head and says, "It has always been the same. It never will be any different." He pretends to be worldly wise. He says, "You will never be able to do anything with prostitutes. It is the oldest trade in the world. There always have been these women and there always will be these women. Nothing can be done. I know, I've seen it." He is an old coward who can't fight to save his blessed life. All cynics are shams and frauds; they are running away and trying to hide the fact that they are running away. The man of the world, if he was the only man there was, wouldn't find any world for him to be a man of very long. He is just an old coward who is getting out of it because he dare not face the suffering and the battle.

If you did what Jesus did it would nearly drive you mad.

I have been in the terrible places in London and watched the little wretched kids that were born rotten and the parents that were riddled with disease from sin. I have returned and wished to God I were dead many a time, I have wished to God I could die and get out of it, have done with it, and never see it any more. Wherever you see evil and suffer for it, you wish you were dead.

But if you do it with Christ you can do it and be happy and be glad and be gay. If I look for a happy man I'll tell you I don't look for him in the hotels among the dancing crowds; I look for him out among the men who are working and doing things. I know a man who worked for twenty years in the worst slums in London, and he is as bright eyed and as jolly today as he can be, because behind him there is always the Cross and the Resurrection, because there is always conquest over trials.

Here is an historical fact: that which Jesus set out in life to do and which on Good Friday appeared impossible that he should do, which was to stamp his name upon the world, he has done. That is an historical fact. Without wealth, without education, without importance, that man who lived in a little corner of the world like an unimportant province in China, and who died the death of a despised criminal on a cross, has stamped his name on the face of the world. On Good Friday it looked as if he couldn't do it; but he has done it, and you can no more deny that than you can deny the world you live in. That means he triumphed.

I have no doubt when Pilate went to bed and his wife blamed him that night, he probably said, "Well, my dear, we will never hear anything about it any more. It is all over." It had only just begun. Before a hundred years were past that same despised Christ was fighting the Roman Empire on its own ground. Something happened that stamped his name forever as the greatest of the great upon the face of the earth, and it has remained stamped there.

Behind the Cross there is the Resurrection, and behind the Resurrection there is another picture, the picture of a man with hands that are wounded and outstretched, going up and up and up into Heaven. In that picture is the meaning of the history of the world, for the world means God, suffering in man to bring him to his Lord. If we had interpreted evolution in the light of the essentials from the beginning, we wouldn't have fallen into this mad business of interpreting it in the light of its beginning and not of its end.

Some say, "We are not sentimentalists. We have no religious prejudices. We take our stand on the solid rock of facts. Look back to the jungles. Look back to where the beasts tramped on one another, to where the birds preyed on birds and fish on fish. There you see the secret of life. Life is a struggle." Then you get miserable and say, "O Lord, religion is going wrong. These people are out for the truth and I can't have my Christ any longer." It all sounds so very hard until you realize what they are doing. They are asking you to go for a walk, looking back in the direction from which you came, and if you do that you will break your necks.

Aristotle saw that years ago. It is a bad thing. The meaning of growth is in its highest point, and the highest point is in Christ of Nazareth triumphant. There is the whole meaning of life. It is the new birth of Christ in the world, the agony that he has gone through and has to go through in you to make his life perfect. The Resurrection, which is the triumph, is the whole meaning of the world. That is the drama to which your faith must attach itself, and when your faith finds its hope in that, then it issues in love, and God keeps you suffering and loving and striving and working for the world. That lifts you up, and it lifts the fight up to a higher level, making it a fight of the mental and spiritual sphere and not of the material sphere.

We say our wars are great wars, but they are insignificant

wars. Nations are exactly like men who quarrel with their wives. As long as they keep their tempers and are suffering to understand one another, the peace is maintained. If they lose their tempers, negotiations are broken off. After they rearrange the furniture, and when they have rearranged it, they have to begin all over again rather worse off than they were before. That is all war means, that men have become impatient of the suffering and pain of working at the spiritual side of it, they have shirked the Cross, therefore they come to the torture of life without God. For those that will not bear the Cross eventually slip back into life without God. That may be joyous at first, but it is hell, meaningless hell, in the end.

That is my confession of faith. The world to me is neither flat nor round; it is cruciform. Literally I don't mean that I always live up to this; I cannot, but I try, and I will have to go on trying. But a great part of my time, in every suffering person I see Christ crucified, in every problem of the world I see Christ crucified. I hear the crucified calling me to put my whole being and soul into this thing, and that is what I plead with you to do, that you may see the whole world in terms of this great drama of Jesus of Nazareth, that you may hear the call to new birth, the call to bear your Cross and to follow after him, to work and to study and to love and to struggle, to make the great unity and the great peace, that you may see behind all that suffering the promise of the Resurrection, and then that glorious crowning picture of the Ascension.

Don't think that is fancy. That is what it means, that is what it has always meant, that the word became flesh, and in terms of human personality acted out before us, it means that in Bethlehem, on Calvary, on the Mount of Olives and in the Ascension we might see the great drama of God's life, the meaning of the universe. He who lives and she who lives with that great drama forever stamped upon their

souls, and in the light of that drama work out their lives and their life problems, will find peace.

Peace does not mean the end of all our striving,
Joy does not mean the drying of our tears;
Peace is the power that comes to souls arriving
Up to the light where God himself appears.

Joy is the wine that God is ever pouring
Into the hearts of those who strive with him;
Lighting their eyes to vision and adoring,
Strengthening their arms to warfare glad and grim.

Bread of Thy Body, give me for my fighting,
Give me to drink Thy sacred blood for wine;
While there are wrongs that need me for the righting,
While there is warfare splendid and divine.

Give me for light the sunshine of Thy sorrow,
Give me for shelter the shadow of Thy Cross,
Give me to share the glory of tomorrow
And gone from my heart is the bitterness of loss.

Only in him can I find hope, who on the Cross was slain, to rise again; only with him, my comrade, God beside me, can I go forward to war with sin and pain. Just sit still and think of the new birth, of Bethlehem, the Calvary, the Resurrection, and the Ascension, and the world as meaning that.

The peace of God that passeth all understanding keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and the love of God and of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, and the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be amongst you and remain with you, in your going out and in your coming in, in your lying down and in your rising up, in your labor and your leisure, in your laughter and your tears, until you come to stand before Him in that day to which there is no sunset and no dawn.

In closing the conference Friday afternoon, Mr. Studdert Kennedy used the following poem:

We shall build on, we shall build on,
On through the cynic's scorning,
On through the coward's warning,
On through the darkest morning,
We shall build on:

City of saints and sages,
High on the Rock of Ages.
Laugh while the tempest rages,
We shall build on.

Christ, though my hands be bleeding,
Fierce though my flesh be bleeding,
Still let me see Thee leading,
Let me build on.

'Til through death's cruel dealing,
Brain racked and reason reeling,
I hear love's trumpets pealing,
And I pass on.

APPENDICES

A

THE SPEAKERS WHO DELIVERED THE ADDRESSES

Dr. A. Bruce Curry, a member of the faculty of Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y., and chairman of the Conference Committee.

Rev. Reinhold Niebuhr, pastor of the Bethel Evangelical Church, Detroit, Mich., and a member of the editorial staff of the *Christian Century*.

Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, president of Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.

Rev. G. A. Studdert Kennedy, secretary of the Industrial Christian Fellowship of England and chaplain to the King of England.

Rev. Howard C. Thurman, pastor of the Mt. Zion ——— Church, Oberlin, Ohio.

Dr. Charles W. Gilkey, pastor of the Hyde Park Baptist Church, Chicago, Ill.

Dean T. T. Lew, of the Department of Theology of the University of Pekin and secretary of the National Christian Education Commission of China.

Dr. Mordecai Johnson, president of Howard University, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Kirby Page, editor of the *World Tomorrow* and international publicist.

Rev. Harold C. Phillips, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Mount Vernon, N. Y.

Dr. Robert A. Millikan, director of the Mount Wilson Observatory.

Dr. Harrison S. Elliott, member of the faculty of Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.

B

MORNING DISCUSSION GROUPS

Because of the very nature and purpose of the conference most of the thinking was concerned with religion and its implications as contrasted to the world in which we live. The two convenient general categories of ideas about religion were first, the objective and abstract reasoning about God, the universe, conventions and institutions either ethical or religious; second, the personal experience of the Divine or supernatural whether through a mystical experience or through an experience of identifying oneself with the people of all classes.

The two analogous categories of ideas about our world were first, the detached objective environment of organized society with its social institutions and traditions; second, the individual's experience in trying to live the Christian way of life in the social order.

At the opening of the first meeting of the discussion groups a questionnaire was submitted for the purpose of revealing the concerns of the delegates. An analysis of the answers to the query: To what questions would you most like to find an answer through the Milwaukee Conference? shows that 86 per cent of the delegates were interested in questions dealing primarily with religious and philosophical problems. Thirty-three of the 86 per cent were questions of abstract, objective, theological problems about the nature of God, the methods and obstacles of finding God and other academic concerns; while the other 53 per cent were questions of concrete, personal problems such as difficulties of finding reality in religious experience. Against this majority 14 per cent of the delegates were concerned about matters involving an analysis of social problems, methods of solution or standards of conduct. Of this 14 per cent all but 1 per cent were entirely impersonal social questions concerned with race, war, economics, campus problems and conventions and the 1 per cent with the individual's specific problems of conduct in relation to these social problems.

These percentages would indicate that the delegates convened at this conference were concerned primarily with problems of their own personal religious life. This is not to be interpreted as evidence of lack of interest in social issues. It was assumed that the delegates were to be those who had already done serious thinking and experimenting in testing Christian conviction by action. Consequently they would be those who have gone beyond the immediate issues to problems of sources and dynamics.

In the actual discussion of the first two sessions of the groups

approximately 60 per cent of them were concerned with impersonal, objective academic questions about the theory of religious experience and 15 per cent with personal concrete religious experience. These percentages are significant when compared to those given above as the results of the honest answers given in the questionnaire. It is evident that students are concerned with personal religious problems but are either reticent to describe very intimate experiences or problems in a group or they are not in the habit of "taking stock" of spiritual and moral resources. Therefore they were unable to relate to their personal problems the data of the speakers on the subject of the first cycle, "Is God accessible and how?" Hence the discussion remained for most part theoretical and "up in the air."

The fact that only 25 per cent of the groups discussed definite social situations at these first two meetings seems to indicate that few students consider social problems as religious challenges.

Finding the discussion of mere theoretical and abstract religious questions futile and unsatisfying, in the third meeting 75 per cent of the groups swung into the second category of social and campus problems. This change of emphasis was to be expected as the natural result of the theme: "The Universality of God," presented by the platform addresses of Gilkey, Lew, Page, and Johnson. Fifteen per cent of the groups discussed the individual's personal responsibility in meeting definite social evils. Only a small minority of 10 per cent of the groups remained in the category of religious ideas. This would seem to indicate the general interest in social problems but a divorcement between them and religious experience.

In the last discussion, following the speakers on the subject of "The Divine Possibilities of Human Life," 55 per cent of the groups in an endeavor to find the relation between social problems and religious experience swung back to the category of abstract, theoretical religious ideas. Therefore it is likely they failed to find the real help which they wanted. Forty-one per cent of the groups remained in the category of social problems, of which 33 per cent dealt with the system and impersonal concerns and 9 per cent with the personal responsibility in that system. Only the remaining 4 per cent seemed to make the step of combining the personal responsibility in the world in which we live with a personal religious experience, realizing that social issues offer personal challenges and a religious experience comes not in spite of the social problem but through it.

Summarizing the above we would say, first, that whereas most of the questions of the delegates were in the realm of religion, most of the talk was about theoretical and academic religious problems during the first two sessions. With the emphases on the "Universality

of God," the discussions centered in the realm of social problems but only a few groups went on into the fourth grouping—that of personal responsibility in the social situations. Therefore, we may conclude that students have not come to think of problems in the social order as personal religious challenges, but hold in their minds a definite separation between the social and the personal.

Second, students who wanted reality found it difficult to find because it involves the concrete and personal and they showed reticence in sharing their experiences, they had not reflected upon nor carefully analyzed the experiences which they had had, and finally they had an inadequate vocabulary to use in describing their experiences.

Third, the speakers did not speak of their own personal experiences or describe how they had come into a religious experience as a result of facing certain problems.

C

INFORMAL DISCUSSION GROUPS

"Well I want to ask that speaker what he means by some of the things he said."

"That was a good speech all right but that isn't where I'm stuck."

Foreseeing that conversation, the conference committee had made possible informal hours in which students could ask questions of the speakers or meet with groups to discuss the questions which concerned them. For three afternoons each platform speaker was available to the hundreds of students who sought him to ask further about questions raised in their minds. At the same time other groups were meeting to discuss questions of special concern to them. While the program committee had foreseen the needs and planned some groups, other groups were planned from day to day at the request of delegates. There was no limit to the range of subjects. A third section of the conference went on trips of observation and understanding to factories, civic and labor organizations, and charitable institutions. There was no assumption of attendance except at the urge of interest. Hundreds flocked to see, listen, and ask questions.

DR. REINHOLD NIEBUHR[1]

When Dr. Niebuhr met an informal group of one hundred twenty-five to one hundred fifty students after his opening address he was

[1] See address, p. 11.

pushed to enlarge on statements which he had made to the conference as a whole.

1. What do you mean by detachment—withdrawal from the world? If we want to change the world can we detach ourselves?

2. What do you mean by an ethical life?

3. Will you explain further your linking communism with foes of religion?

What should be our goal in economic life?

4. Are students really facing situations? asked a college professor. Isn't it true that we can't do anything because our world isn't real? parried a student.

What is the use of being good?

If we need control as contrasted to impulse, what happens to creative arts?

5. Should persons give themselves to reforms and deny marriage?

6. What place does prayer have in life?

Words are so tricky when they are set down without the support of more words and tone of voice and knowledge of the speaker that it is impossible to give the answers to the many queries. Yet one would like to indicate that Dr. Niebuhr was not making a plea for asceticism; was not trying to hold religion within the bounds of an ethical system; was not advocating communism or celibacy.

He sought to foster a critical intelligence; to place personality first and to show how our present civilization of possessions, economic production, political machinery and family life culminated in desire for power that does not allow for the development of the individual. His desire is not for an utopia or high-sounding goal but for "next steps" and specifics cast on a courageous scale.

Are you satisfied with someone else's brief statement or are you tackling your own "specifics" with intelligent courage?

SCIENCE AND RELIGION

Dr. Philip Northrup, Yale University, conducted the group on science and religion. This subject naturally attracted a general attendance but met the interest of science students in the main. The answers to questions involved data from philosophy, biology, psychology, and physics. Although answers cannot be given adequately in the space available, questions show points of difficulty.

What is the relation between mechanism and religion?

Is there a conflict between religion and science?

Does science force belief in God?

Does science give a sense of values?

Why do you believe in God? Is it a process of nationalization?

Are the positivists merely short sighted?

Does your conception of the universe represent a necessarily pantheistic hypothesis?

Why does evolution not make evil as well as good a basic result?

On one side of the room is a science major who is interested in the theories. Yonder is a student who gets lost in the history of philosophy but wants to reconcile seeming differences. The one is following a presentation of a new chemical experiment. The other waits for the summing up which declares that in the heart of the physical order is an understanding father.

Are you willing to dig into the findings of science and stay on the job long enough to work out your own basis for life?

INTELLECTUAL PROBLEMS OF ONE'S CHRISTIAN FAITH

Dr. H. H. Tweedy of Yale University. The problems proposed by the group were: Evil, theory of atonement, prayer; Is God a person? materialism as a way of life, and immortality. The last question was of interest to the largest number.

DR. T. T. LEW,

A Chinese philosopher was being questioned by a group of young Americans. Was it sufficient for the Church to strengthen Christian principles? He had spoken from the platform of the failure of Christianity often to embody the spirit of Christ. To what extent can the Golden Rule be applied to the American immigration law? Do we have to send any more missionaries to China?

RESOURCES

The resources of Jesus for the world today was the theme of the conference. Some students wanted to investigate that subject more directly and further than they had gone in the general session. A group chaired by Bruce Curry and Henry P. Van Dusen was arranged. The questions were chiefly about prayer. Is prayer necessary to the highest life? Prayer as aspiration, illumination, release of energy, and as intercession was considered. First there is the vague outreach, perhaps only in the realm of appreciation. Then comes directed definite prayer to an accessible being known as power, energy, love, or purpose at their best. Each must begin by finding the element of present experience which holds most depth and reality and is akin to prayer.

But how does one begin the religious life? The beginning may consist of that experience which pulls one up to his best with the

demand so great that there is a great sense of need akin to sin. Prayer is chiefly valid when the one praying is tied up with a situation too great for unhelped solution.

What is the relation of mystical experience to psychological attitudes and findings? What is the relative value of autosuggestion and intelligent prayer? The discussion ended on the note that religion offers enough explanation for beginning to live positively with the recognition that that very living will bring the further necessary explanation as it progresses.

RELATION OF MEN AND WOMEN

One hundred twenty-five young men and women faced Dr. Edith Hale Swift. She talked of sex in an even casual tone. It is a subject "over which a veil had been drawn" in the past but she presented it as a usual and desirable factor in life. It is a force to be directed rather than perverted. An idealism based, not on repression, but on understanding. They questioned her concerning:

What is the basis for choosing a mate?
What is the physical effect of petting?
How prevalent is venereal disease?
Should sex conferences be held in the schools?
Does smoking have effect on the sex organs?
Are women more in favor of marriage than men are?
What are the physical effects of engagement?

Can you find the help in facts and attitudes that gives you freedom to find joy and not license?

MILITARY TRAINING IN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

There had been references to the R. O. T. C. in the arena. Delegates especially interested gathered to consider whether it was right for them to support military training. (No indeed, they were not all men.) They had been talking for some time when one student asked: "Isn't it my patriotic duty to support my country in time of war?" Dr. George Coe of Columbia University, who was leader of the group, talked about ways in which he wanted to defend his country from all enemies. "When the college president forbids the discussion of military training on the campus what do you do?" What are certain people doing for promotion of peace? The Committee on Militarism and Education was reported as finding free speech its most difficult point. The chairman asked if any one had been told what to do? "No."

Do you believe in free speech? Are you willing to think and speak even if you are the only one in favor of the R. O. T. C.?

TRIPS TO INDUSTRIAL AND CIVIC-SOCIAL CENTERS

More than 1,000 students took conducted trips on three afternoons under the direction of Jerome Davis of Yale Divinity School. The visit to one factory is described by a student: "We gathered in one street car, about eighty in all. Kirby Page held a discussion on the car during the thirty-minute ride to the factory. Questions asked by students centered around labor; justice to laborers. Whether strikes and injunctions were Christian; the workings of unions, etc. One question was whether, if unions were universal, people's actions and lives would not become controlled by groups, thus losing individuality. Henry Ford became a topic of discussion. Was or is he a benefactor or a menace? Should public utilities such as mines be privately owned? Is the profit motive an economic necessity?

"The questions asked at the factory centered around machinery, accidents, hours of labor, regularity of work, and wages. How many men were educated? Did they begin as apprentices? We saw that the work was hard, tedious, and much of it not a little dangerous and dirty. The general impression seemed to be along the line of the immensity of industry, its complexity, its hold on our civilization, and our need of a deep understanding of it if we are to cope with labor problems or bring justice to the workers and Christ's way in industry."

Trips were taken to the jail, the Chamber of Commerce, the communists, the trade unions, the insane asylum, the tuberculosis sanitarium. A few talks were given by prominent men connected with civic and industrial activities of the city. Mr. Davis tried to show students how they could make education available to trade unions and prison inmates and how they must know conditions of the present civilization if they are to be serviceable citizens.

How much do you know about your community—its labor conditions, public institutions, civic organizations, its possibilities?

CAMPUS ATTITUDES

Dean Irma Voigt of Ohio University. Religion, scholarship, rules and regulations, and prohibition were the points raised for discussion. Under rules and regulations, students considered the greater freedom of the present day, the lack of an inner control to replace the old rules, and the pressure of popular opinion and mob rule. Student authority was considered no different from faculty authority. Cooperation is the best plan. Students think too much about others and not enough about themselves. Any conduct could be excused by calling it human. People were called most human

when they were at their best. Prohibition was not considered a campus problem. The few boozers on a campus present the same difficulty as the same few in any community.

What are your attitudes to questions that are raised on the campus?

THE MEANING OF PRAYER

Glenn Clark, Professor of Literature at MacAllister College and author of the "Soul's Sincere Desire." He talked at length about the need of casting out fear and anger, the releasing of creative living, the power of love. How can I help a man by praying for him? How do I surrender myself that the power of God may flow through me? How in striving and praying can I find God? If a river is put in a bucket it is no longer a river. If God is defined he is not God. Get into the current of life and know him in its force. Find God expressed in us and as a help in any line of activity. How do you formulate prayers? How do you begin?

Are you practising prayer that it may be a force in your life?

KIRBY PAGE

Kirby Page had spoken from the platform on International Relations and the religion of Jesus. A large group of students met him in informal hour to push back of his first remarks. Questions rained thick and fast. What has been of most significance to peace in the last fifteen years? The League of Nations and the Locarno Pact which outlawed war between two countries. What is the difference between patriotism and nationalism? Is there a moral stimulus in war? Certainly. There was more real self-sacrifice in the World War than the world had ever before seen but it was released in a distinctive way. What is a substitute for this stimulus?

How would you compare Mussolini and Calles? What is the history of the Nicaragua intervention? We must decide whether or not it is right for one country to control others for property interests. The party of another country asks for help from the United States because then it is sure to win. Is there need for an international police force? How would property be protected if an army was not sent into another country? Who authorizes the military forces to proceed? If a nation promises not to fight how can it be made to keep its agreement? Public disapproval is the most powerful method.

Diplomatic relations might be severed or financial ostracism might be used. Do you advocate unrestricted immigration? Other nations ought to have some voice. Is there any menace to world peace in

our effort to maintain a high standard of living? It is high time we began to think.

Do we need to abolish the profit motive? What is going to be the usefulness of diplomacy in the future compared to the past? What is your opinion of the war debts? Debts and reparations should be wiped out. Then a conference should be called, perhaps by the League of Nations, to consider ability to pay and effect on the creditor.

How much do you know of international relations? Where do you get your information?

Informal hours were not neatly divided sessions but had the range and duplication of student interest. Prayer, science, and religion, definition of God, how to know what is right came out in more than one group. Differences of opinion on a given subject between two persons were common. Students listened and questioned and tried to harmonize these differences in working out their own philosophies of life. The leaders and the speakers pushed each other in a mutually stimulating way. All seemed to end with a desire for more time, more questions and more answers.

D

FINDINGS

The findings which appear below were not considered resolutions but expressions of opinion reflecting various points of view which prevailed among the delegates.

War

1. I will not support any war. 327.
2. I am ready to support some wars but not others. 740.
3. I will support any war that is declared by the authority of my country. 95.
4. I am not ready to commit myself. 356.

Race

1. I am willing to give to the members of every race the same opportunities that I have. Almost unanimous.
2. Regarding some races as inherently inferior to my own, I favor keeping them in their places. 11.

3. On my campus I will deny to no one of any race any privilege that I claim for myself. 681.

4. I am not ready to commit myself. 35.

The Industrial System

1. While recognizing that there are certain evils in the present capitalistic system, we believe that the system as a whole is satisfactory and in accordance with the principles of Jesus. 38.

2. We believe that the present competitive economic order based on production for profit rather than production for use is wrong. 800.

3. We believe in order to help transform this wrong economic order, all students should do all in their power to strengthen and improve the American organized labor movement. 385.

4. We believe that the present economic order should be displaced by a cooperative distributive system and a method of production in which the workers themselves share in the control. 592.

5. While recognizing certain evils in the policies of the Communists who are trying to change our economic order, we believe on the whole these policies are more satisfactory than the present economic system and are nearer to the ideals of Jesus. 57.

6. We are not ready to commit ourselves. 67.

A General Resolution

That we, conscious of the limitations of our knowledge upon the great questions of this conference, ask our colleges and universities to provide better opportunities to learn the facts concerning our international relations, the causes and the cure of war, the human factor in industry, the causes of discontent, and the problems of religion in the modern world. We ask also for opportunity to hear

upon our campuses the expression of minority opinion by speakers chosen by the students. Unanimously adopted.

E

CONFERENCE STATISTICS

Total attendance	2,500
Delegates	2,296
Foreign students	241
Nations represented	35
Colleges represented	442

F

ORGANIZATIONS AND COMMITTEES REPRESENTED IN THE EXHIBIT

The following organizations or committees occupied booths:
Student Volunteer Movement
Intercollegiate Prohibition Association
The League for Industrial Democracy
National Council for the Prevention of War
Missionary Education Movement
Committee on Militarism in Education
Council of Women for Home Missions
Women's International League
Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America
Foreign Division Y M C A.
National Board of the Y W C A.
Interracial Commission
The Intercollegian
The World Tomorrow

G

OFFICERS OF THE CONFERENCE AND THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE

CONFERENCE STAFF

Conference Chairmen: Dorothy Richards, *DePauw;* John M. Moore, *Park College.*
Business Committee—Cochairmen: D. R. Porter, Leslie Blanchard.
Executive Secretary: A. R. Elliott.
Program Secretary: Grace Loucks.

Registrar: Mabel T. Everett.
Discussion Groups: Bruce Curry, *Leader;* Katherine E. Ashworth, *Secretary.*
Informal Hours: Grace Loucks.
Milwaukee *Intercollegian:* Corilla Brodnax, E. B. Schultz.
Exhibit: Charles H. Corbett, Elizabeth Curtiss, Era Betzner, John M. Currie.
Head Usher: Glenn Jackson.
Press: A. E. Hungerford, Agnes A. Sharpe.
Hospitality to Speakers: J. W. Bergthold, Hilda Howard.
Hospitality to Foreign Students: Charles D. Hurrey, Anne Wiggin, Milton Stauffer, Juliette Derricotte, Gale Seaman, Aline Burgess.
Book Shop: Winnifred Wygal, Francis P. Miller.
Choir: Annie Kate Gilbert.
Pianists: Margaret Batton, Helen Holbrook.
Editor Conference Report: Francis P. Miller.
Editors: "After Milwaukee What," Lois Wildy, E. W. Warrington.
Editors: "Milwaukee on the Campus"

CONFERENCE BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The Business Committee for the National Student Conference is composed of representatives of the General Conference Committee, which worked for several months, members of the Field Councils of both Associations and other student leaders.

Katharine Ashworth, National Student Council, Y W C A, New England, New York State.
George R. Baker, Secretary, Baptist Board of Education.
E. Fay Campbell, Graduate Secretary Y M C A, Yale University.
W. C. Craver, Senior Student Secretary, Colored Department, Y M C A.
Erma Coffman, College Puget Sound. National Student Assembly Y W C A.
George Corwin, President, Y M C A, Syracuse University. *Chairman,* Middle Atlantic Field Council, Y M C A.
Ray B. Culver, Interstate Student Secretary for the Northwest.
A. Bruce Curry, Union Theological Seminary, New York. (Ex-officio) Chairman, Milwaukee Conference Committee.
Juliette Derricotte, National Student Council, Y W C A.
Mary Custis Foster, Secretary Mount Holyoke. Formerly Chairman Southern Division Y W C A Council.
Virginia Franke, Secretary Cornell University, N. Y.

Allis Graham, University Chicago. National Student Council, Geneva Division.
Maude Gwinn, Secretary National Student Council, Y W C A. Geneva Division.
Francis Henson, President, Y M C A, Lynchburg College. *Chairman,* Southern Field Council, Y M C A.
Mary Hunter, Secretary, University West Virginia.
Paul Huston, Graduate Student, Harvard University. *Chairman,* National Council of Student Associations, Y M C A.
G. W. Johnson, Student, Yale Divinity School.
Bob Kerr, President, Y M C A, University of California. *Chairman,* Pacific Regional Council, Y M C A.
Mary Mangigian, University of Pennsylvania. President National Student Assembly Y W C A.
Roy McCullough, State Student Secretary, Michigan.
Evelyn Miller, National Student Council, Seabeck Division Y W C A.
Francis P. Miller, Administrative Secretary, World's Student Christian Federation.
John M. Moore, Professor at Park College, Missouri. *Chairman,* Southwestern Field Council, Y M C A.
Grace Oldfather, Texas University.
Maria Peterfy, Harvard. Hungarian Student Movement.
Paul Pfeutze, Kansas State Agricultural College. *Chairman,* Rocky Mountain Field Council, Y M C A.
Dorothy Richards, *Chairman* C. C. A.
Andrew T. Roy, Traveling Secretary, Student Volunteer Movement.
Marie Russ, Secretary, Kansas University.
W. A. Smith, Texas University.
Ella Ree Steck, Langston University.
Katharine Upchurch, University of Tennessee.
Henry P. Van Dusen, Instructor, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.
Dean Erma Voight, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
Doris Webster, President Y W C A.
Lois Wildy, Graduate Student Columbia University.
Dorothy Winchell, University of Wisconsin. President, Y W C A. *Chairman,* Geneva Conference Committee.
Warren L. Wright, President Y M C A, Iowa State College. *Chairman,* Central Regional Council Y M C A.

243.2
Natl. student conf. N213
Religion on the campus

243.2
N213